

# College

## Composition and Communication

THE OFFICIAL BULLETIN OF THE CONFERENCE ON  
COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

EDITOR

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, *Purdue University*

EDITORIAL BOARD

FRANCIS E. BOWMAN, *Duke University*; JANE DALE, *Oregon College of Education*;  
W. NELSON FRANCIS, *Franklin and Marshall College*; JAMES B. McMILLAN,  
*University of Alabama*; STEWART S. MORGAN, *The Agricultural and  
Mechanical College of Texas*; SAMUEL WEINGARTEN, *Chicago  
City Junior College, Wright Branch*

OCT 24 1955

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

Vol. V	May, 1954	No. 2
LINGUISTIC RESEARCH NEEDED IN COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION— <i>Harold B. Allen</i> .....		55
FIELDS OF RESEARCH IN RHETORIC— <i>Henry W. Sams</i> .....		60
SOMETHING OF MORPHEMICS— <i>George P. Faust</i> .....		65
THE COMMUNICATION PROGRAM AT PACE COLLEGE— <i>Carl Lefevre</i> .....		70
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE PROGRAM OF TRAINING FOR TEACHING COLLEGE COMPOSITION— <i>Alvin Thaler</i> .....		73
SENTENCE STRUCTURE AS STYLE— <i>Viola K. Rivenburgh</i> .....		75
IBID AND LIKE THAT— <i>Alison White</i> .....		77
NSSC NEWS— <i>Donald E. Bird</i> .....		79
MEASURING SUCCESS IN COMPOSITION— <i>J. Gordon Eaker</i> .....		81
CCCC BULLETIN BOARD.....		84
CORRESPONDENCE—THE PLACE OF "MASS COMMUNICATIONS" IN A CURRICULUM— <i>Louis E. Ingelhart</i> .....		85
SOME OF THE YEAR'S WORK IN COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION.....		87

College Composition and Communication is published quarterly in February, May, October, and December. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, single copies, 75c. Entered as second class matter June 28, 1950, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Orders and business correspondence should be addressed to J. N. Hook, 704 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois. All other communications should be addressed to George S. Wykoff, University Hall, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

# National Council of Teachers of English

## Conference on College Composition and Communication

### 1954 OFFICERS

T. A. BARNHART, Chairman  
State Teachers College, St. Cloud

JEROME W. ARCHER, Associate Chairman  
Marquette University

IRWIN GRIGGS, Assistant Chairman  
Temple University

BEVERLY E. FISHER, Secretary  
Santa Monica City College

J. N. HOOK, Treasurer  
8110 South Halsted St., Chicago

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, Editor  
Purdue University

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### Universities

RICHARD S. BEAL, Boston University  
GEORGE P. FAUST, Kentucky  
ROBERT GORRELL, Nevada  
JOHN C. HODGES, Tennessee  
FRANCIS SHOEMAKER, Teachers College,  
Columbia  
PHILIP R. WIKELUND, Indiana  
McDONALD WILLIAMS, Wilberforce  
KARL YOUNG, Brigham Young

#### Liberal Arts Colleges

WAYNE C. BOOTH, Earlham  
KARL W. DYKEMA, Youngstown  
L. A. KING, Muskingum  
STRANG LAWSON, Colgate  
CARL LEFEVRE, Pace  
SISTER MIRIAM JOSEPH, C.S.C., St. Mary's  
(Indiana)  
ALBERT UPTON, Whittier  
MRS. W. R. VAN GELDER, Howard  
F. EARL WARD, Macalester

#### Teachers Colleges

JEAN MALMSTROM, Western Michigan  
College of Education  
RACHEL SALISBURY, Milwaukee  
KATHERINE SCOTT, Georgia State College  
for Women  
WRIGHT THOMAS, Cortland

#### Technical Schools

EMMA BEEKMAN, Los Angeles Trade-Tech.  
T. J. FARR, Tenn. Polytech. Inst.  
FRED LORCH, Iowa State  
HERBERT B. NELSON, Oregon State  
ROBERT E. TUTTLE, General Motors Institute

#### Junior Colleges

DONALD E. BIRD, Stephens  
GLADYS BROWN, Little Rock  
INEZ FROST, Hutchinson  
GORDON MILLS, Los Angeles  
MARGUERITE H. MOREY, Colby Jr.

# Linguistic Research Needed in Composition and Communication<sup>1</sup>

HAROLD B. ALLEN<sup>2</sup>

Late in 1952 a letter came to me from a new member here in St. Louis. He wrote: "The hammering out of some ideas on an anvil as broad as the CCCC seems to me big with possibilities for all of us who are trying for a better freshman course."

That statement is worth looking at again. Several persons who, like me, have been concerned in one way or another with the freshman course for a quarter of a century have spoken to me about the new climate in which we find ourselves. One even called it The Great Awakening. For the first time freshman English instructors and administrators are working together on a national scale to attack our common problems. In its four short years the CCCC has provided extraordinary stimulus to constructive thinking and positive action about these problems.

Already in one direction this stimulus has initiated a nation-wide factual study most significant to us all. This is the study of professional status under the supervision of our new assistant chairman, Irwin Griggs, of Temple University. But in other directions our several actions are not the result of similarly planned research. Largely as a result of our workshops and panel discussions some new courses have been set up and existing ones modified; new materials

have replaced old materials, and new methods have ousted old methods. But how much of this change was due to the influence of some persuasive leader? How much was due to the prestige of some individual or some institution, or even to an understandable acceptance of a new plan or a new approach as a welcome relief from the frustration caused by an old one?

I do think that much of this change is for the better. I like to believe that the assumptions upon which changes are made are generally valid assumptions. Most of us are pragmatic enough to give up what obviously doesn't work and to put in its place what does offer some promise of success. But the fact remains that we who work in the freshman field are still operating principally with *a priori* thinking and with empirical procedures.

Have you been teaching for more than a year or two? Think back quickly to some of the numerous questions that from time to time have arisen about the plan and content of your own course, to say nothing of the discussions, if not better disputes, over particular parts of it even to the way in which a given assignment should be presented. Have necessary decisions always been based upon factual data? Or upon opinions, or upon the dominance of some personality, or upon an administrator's authority, or upon precedent, or upon sheer expedience?

Take a look at the freshman programs in a dozen or so representative institutions. You will search in vain for the evidence of any body of scientifically determined facts upon which a given

<sup>1</sup>EDITOR'S NOTE: This paper is slightly abridged from the opening talk at the opening session of the CCCC Spring Meeting in St. Louis, Missouri, March 4-6, 1954. The general subject for this first session was "Fields for Research in Composition and Communication, and an Illustration." The second paper, "Fields of Research in Rhetoric," by Henry W. Sams, is also published in this issue of *College Composition and Communication*. The third paper, "Misspelling of College Students," by Thomas Clark Pollock, will be published in *College English*.

<sup>2</sup>University of Minnesota

course was constructed. Here is a course which clearly is an attempt to modernize the application of classical rhetoric. Here is one including a variety of general orientation materials apparently present in answer to the demands of some theory of general education. Here is another which inherits the theory of prose models and which also offers numerous drill exercises in formal grammar. Here is one which contains material designed to remove personality frustrations, complexes, inhibitions, and aberrations, on the evident premise that a student can't write or talk effectively if he is troubled by any of those deviations from a hypothetical norm. Keep on looking. You will find continuing diversity, ever-bewildering variety.

On the shelves in our offices are text after text, manual after manual, drill-book after drillbook, aimed at the freshman target—and all different. At this very convention more than twenty publishers have exhibits intended to acquaint us with their own current and always superior additions to the vast collection of freshman textbooks . . . In textbooks too, then, we find continuing diversity, ever-bewildering variety. Can all roads lead to Rome?

Without insisting that there is only one road, we might fear that some roads lead to a dead end and we might reasonably hope that some roads would be faster, smoother, and safer than others. And if so, we should like to know. That means not simply collecting such reactions as "It was just wonderful" or "We sure had a rough time," but rather finding out the road material, the distance, the gradients, and the availability of fuel and accommodations.

Actually we have very little of that kind of information about our own work. Perhaps it's because we've been brought up as individualists in a humanistic literary tradition, perhaps because we as a

group have looked askance at the kinds of studies encouraged by our educationist colleagues, perhaps for other reasons. At all events, when we have produced research it has not been in the field of composition and communication. We simply do not have scientifically collected and verified data upon which to base our selection or rejection of content, or of teaching methods, or of testing procedures—or even of our objective itself.

This is true in every area of our teaching, even though we are now considering only two of them—linguistics and rhetoric. The former is my own assignment—and I'm setting rather wide limits for it so as to include the whole range of our work which concerns language matters in contrast with that which deals with matters of organization, logic, and inference. I hope that this division is agreeable to Professor Sams, who is to look at the area of rhetoric.

It is much easier to raise questions than to answer them, and many more could be raised than can be listed here in this brief talk. But it strikes me that if we are to insist upon the required freshman course, if we are to continue to demand a large share of the college income to support the most expensively taught course in the undergraduate curriculum, if we are to have consciences free from guilt, then we'd better begin finding out answers to such questions as these. If you don't like my questions, you won't have much trouble in thinking of others. It's unhappily easy once you begin with this one, "What evidence have I for the validity of what I am doing with these students in this class at this time?"

The questions that we ask about the linguistic part of our work will fall easily into three groups, those dealing with content, those with method, and those with testing and examining. Many of these questions reflect, however, a very significant larger question we might look



at first. This concerns the objective itself.

Should we aim at developing the student's writing ability alone in the freshman course, or should we aim at developing his ability as a communicator in both writing and speaking? Linguistics itself is fast becoming an exact science, with procedures of analysis more rigorous than in any other behavioral science. Linguistics recognizes language as structure, and considers speaking and hence writing as overt manifestations of structure not to be treated as independent and discrete subjects. Since we are essentially language teachers when we deal with language matters in composition, should we do what linguists say teachers of foreign languages should do, consider speech proficiency in close relation with writing proficiency? It may well be, but we need research even to validate our objective.

Now with respect to content we do not really know whether it is possible for a student to become a good communicator as effectively without linguistic knowledge as with it. It is my present conviction that power in the use of language, rather than mere skill, derives from sensitive awareness of the manifold resources of language, in structure as well as in vocabulary. This conviction rests on *a priori* grounds; but so does the belief of those who omit linguistic content and rely upon dogma. We need evidence that comes from research. Then if linguistic content is to be admitted, what should it be and how much should it be? Should we try to make use of the linguist's structural analysis of English in order to improve the student's sentence control and sentence punctuation? Professor Fries insists that knowledge of English structure can have this result. But the basic research that he and George Trager and Henry Lee Smith have already made in English syntax

must now be followed by applied research to ascertain whether this knowledge actually has pedagogical value. Our students have had years of more or less desultory acquaintance with the Latin-ate grammar of the schools. Will it help them to write and speak better if in their freshman year we confront them with the quite different procedures and different terminology of structural analysis? Some of us think it will; perhaps more will think so after the three sessions of the panel on Modern Linguistics and the Teaching of Freshman English.<sup>3</sup> But research alone can finally support or reject this belief.

Another kind of linguistic knowledge is that of the distribution of variants according to social and educational correlations. This is probably the most controversial question of all. What are among the most widely-selling handbooks in the country, *The Writer's Guide* and *The Harbrace Handbook*, are in strong contrast with each other in both theory and practice with respect to the treatment of usage, but their authors, like you and me, must still operate pretty largely upon an empirical basis. Though some single studies have been made, no general body of research sustains either the assumption that the theory of appropriateness can be taught successfully to most freshmen or the contrary assumption that it can't be so taught and that therefore we must rely upon prescriptive rules. You may have enjoyed some of the recent attempts to provide new paradigms for various verbs and verb phrases. Those of us who recently were called the New Grammar boys by one of the more acidulous of my colleagues look at the users of *Harbrace* and similar texts and say, "They are reactionary. You rationalize your prejudices. We realistically draw

<sup>3</sup> It is planned to publish—in a future issue of *College Composition and Communication*—the papers given at the panel on "Modern Linguistics and the Teaching of Freshman English."—EDITOR.

conclusions from scientifically collected evidence." And back comes the retort courteous about the New Grammarians: "They have no standards. You are pretty liberal yourself. We are the guardians of a noble and ancient heritage of correctness." All of us would benefit from a major research project to determine which classroom attitude toward usage actually produces the more discriminating user of language.

There are some incidental questions to be asked here, too. Linguists have often poked fun at what they term our superstitious notions about pronunciation, but they would insist then that to acquire a sound attitude students must have tools of observation. Are we to take time to teach the phonetic alphabet and to drill in its use? We need studies to determine the efficacy of that proposal.

Another question: which specific usage items have greater validity for inclusion within the freshman course? In the freshmen in a given institution in a given area what is the range and what is the frequency of occurrence of any specific deviation from Standard English? Such a study, useful there, has been made at the University of Michigan. But we need this information everywhere if we are not to treat our patients for shingles when they have the hives.

One question related to the fact that so-called errors vary in frequency in different institutions is this one: How shall we treat regional variations, that is, dialect? In the past it has generally been classed as beyond the pale. But there are now those who insist that some sound information about American regional differences in grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation will help lead to that discriminating use of language we are aiming at. The various Linguistic Atlas projects are increasingly supplying this information. But here again research is needed to validate the belief that some

of this information will be not only entertaining, as it is, but also useful to freshmen.

For years freshman instructors have been beguiled by claims of high-powered vocabulary builders. This is still an area of claims and counter-claims. Granted that it is desirable to know various meanings of many words, we still do not know how best to acquire that vocabulary richness. Should we include in our courses a great deal of content concerning the dictionary? Should we use special books on vocabulary with the full treatment of Greek and Latin roots incorporated in our word-board? We need research before these questions can be answered.

How far should we go in including content drawn from the field of semantics or even of general semantics? Given our objective, how much of the semantic corpus is needed in the freshman course to attain optimum benefits in terms of developed effectiveness in communicating? About eight years ago many of us really went off the deep end by plunging headlong into general semantics. But we don't actually know whether we should have done that, or whether we are still beyond our depth. We look to research for an answer to guide us.

Let's sample the questions one can quickly bring to mind with respect to methods. If we recognize that general communicative effectiveness is our objective, how can we best reach the goal in terms of exercise materials, classroom devices, and conference techniques? Some general research has been done; little of it is directly in our own field. We need much more. Is usage best taught by lecture, by handbook precept, by theme-correcting, or by inductive investigation of speech by the student himself? Which ways of correcting student writing are most efficient and most effective in terms of our goal? Sure, we all know how we

prefer to do it. But upon what body of tested fact does our preference rest?

Are we in a course called "communication"? How can we best teach the linguistic elements of speech and those of writing—separately in chunks or together—in correlation as parts of the same whole? Can our choice be validated by tested results in student use of language? Can we best help the student to speech effectiveness through panel discussions or individual speeches, or through techniques which have been called group dynamics?

Are audio-visual aids such as the tape recorder and the opaque projector just time-consuming gadgets to play around with, or can we use them to make our teaching more efficient? For example, can selected bits of recorded conversation showing range of usage variations help to teach those basic facts about usage which point to correlation with socioeconomic status. Can the opaque projector help a student to develop his power of self-criticism of his own writing? We need experimentation and conclusions based upon that experimentation.

Linguists insist that the teaching of reading is essentially an application of linguistic science and that linguistic knowledge will make the process more efficient. It is true that much experimenting has been going on, but some of it with considerable linguistic naivete. We need research soundly based. This is equally true in the field of listening, where only lately has any serious investigation been initiated. Linguists would say to the listening researchers that they too might well profit from attention to such matters as the signals of structure in seeking to promote greater listening skill.

With respect to testing, whether for diagnosis or for measure of achievement

in language use, we need a great deal of research before we can be confident that our tests really test what we consider important. Only recently has new research been undertaken to develop better tests. That's all to the good, but we would agree that much more research is necessary. With one exception a student's mastery of any part of the complex continuum we call language is not going to be measured by tests which, like the familiar A.C.E. usage test, ignore the non-linguistic context in which a linguistic form occurs. The exception probably is in the field of spelling, but even here Professor Marckwardt's study at Michigan has demonstrated already that linguistic knowledge can do much not only to simplify the teaching of spelling but also to make possible the construction of spelling tests which have different weights for different types of errors . . .

Now it's all very well for me to suggest areas in which research needs to be undertaken if we are to teach the language better. It's quite another thing to get the research done.

Most of us belong to departments in which the traditionally approved research patterns permit literary history and literary biography, literary analysis and criticism, and historical philology. These patterns do not permit research in the validity of course content or in teaching methods. Would your department, or that in which you did your graduate work, accept a doctoral dissertation on such a topic as "The Correlation between Learning Greek and Latin Roots in Freshman English and the Development of Vocabulary Power"? If the department in which you teach insists upon continued research as a means of improving status in rank and salary, would it accept that type of research?

On the other hand, our own departments have tended to look askance at our colleagues in schools and colleges of edu-

cation where this kind of research is done. Traditionally we have belittled it and have decried quantitative and statistical methods in arriving at conclusions. As a result most such investigations have been directed toward elementary and secondary school teaching and not toward our own work.

This is the status quo. It does not need to be a permanent status. We must insist that this type of research is both necessary and legitimate for people in the composition and communication field. We can aim at having at least one member of each freshman staff a person

trained in this type of research. We can encourage some graduate students to look toward such studies. Most important of all, we can work together as an organization so that significant research will be undertaken not only on one campus but on many colleges and universities at the same time. It is now the large-scale directed co-operative study that we most imperatively need. In its efforts to meet that need our Conference on College Composition and Communication really can bring about for us the day of the New Learning, the Great Awakening.

## Fields of Research in Rhetoric<sup>1</sup>

HENRY W. SAMS<sup>2</sup>

What are some of the fields of research in rhetoric?

First of all, I can limit the implications of the phrase "field of research." A field of research, as I understand it here, is data which is known to be of value, but whose value is not fully known. In other words, research can be said to have found a new area only after someone has penetrated its outer boundaries and discovered something there. It continues to be a field of research so long as anything of importance remains to be mapped. I intend to limit my remarks to questions concerning rhetoric which have been asked, but not finally answered.

Second, I can emphasize some of the implications of the word "rhetoric" as I understand them. I have no intention of venturing a new definition of rhetoric to compete with all the other definitions that have been made in the past, or of selecting a favorite among those definitions. Instead, I will sketch the funda-

mental conditions of rhetoric which channel and contain research. My description of these conditions was devised under the influence of a difficult but rewarding article entitled "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," by Richard McKeon, published in *Speculum* in 1942, and reprinted recently in a volume entitled *Critics and Criticism, Ancient and Modern*, under the editorship of Ronald Crane. These conditions as I phrase them for myself are three in number:

*First*, rhetoric is a situational art. A work of rhetoric includes in its essential strategy the historical situation in which it was presented. For example, consider Lincoln's inaugural addresses. The student who analyzes them without knowledge in some detail of the circumstances in which they were delivered would have no way of accounting for, or even of detecting, their crucial elements. History is more important in the study of rhetorical works than in the study of literary works of other kinds. Its pertinence is more immediate.

The *second* condition is that rhetoric is systematic. Perhaps this is the hardest

<sup>1</sup> A paper on the general subject, "Fields for Research in Composition and Communication," read at the first general session, March 4, 1954, CCCC meeting, St. Louis, Missouri.

<sup>2</sup> University of Chicago



of all conditions for contemporary students, for we tend to compensate for the scientizing of our colleagues, and to resist attempts to represent composition in terms of methodologies. As a matter of fact, there is method in all good rhetorical works. In order to talk about rhetorical works historically, it is necessary to understand the history of rhetorical theory and the characteristics of rhetorical systems. For example, if I should undertake an explication of a fourteenth-century English sermon in terms of Aristotle's rhetoric, I should probably end with an explanation quite inaccurate as history, however valuable I might be able to make it in other ways. Equally inappropriate—applied to such a work—would be the rhetoric of Thomas Wilson, Richard Whateley, or Brooks and Warren. Research in rhetoric requires knowledge of rhetorical theory as changing historic fact.

The *third* condition is that rhetoric is practical. By this I mean only that the principles of rhetoric are not first principles. Rhetoric is assimilated and shaped by the philosophies which it serves. Like all mediate instruments, it exerts influences of its own, but philosophy is the prime mover. One must study carefully to know what happens to a given rhetorical idea when it is transplanted from one philosophical context to another. This, by the way, is one of the areas in which Kenneth Burke has much to offer. He is a keen and learned student of philosophy—which may be one of the reasons for his reputation for being obscure.

With these limitations and conditions in mind, I shall describe some of the researches that seem to me worth undertaking.

The first task of research, in rhetoric as elsewhere, is editorial. Nothing can be done until the data are catalogued and made accessible. And the editorial state

of rhetoric is uneven—much better at some points than at others.

The first editorial step was effectively completed a hundred years ago. Reasonably dependable editions of the principal texts were available in the original languages by the time Halm finished his compendium of minor rhetoricians in 1852.

The period of systematic and inclusive *translation* is much more recent—more recent, even, than the period of translating literature of every other kind. It was only four years ago that the Loeb Library could add to its list H. M. Hubbell's version of Cicero's unfinished *De Inventione*, thereby replacing the old and rather unsatisfactory translation by Yonge in the Bohn Library series. The equally important *Ad Herennium*, never before available in English, has been edited and translated by Professor Harry Caplan of Cornell, and is scheduled soon to appear in the Loeb series. Scholars are still discussing among themselves who ought to take responsibility for translation of the rhetoric of Athonius.

Perhaps I should pause and say what translations have to do with research. I was raised, as I suppose you were, to believe that if translations are involved, it isn't research, and if research is going on, there are no translations in it. I can't argue this point here. However, I have surveyed the bibliography of rhetoric, and I assure you that anyone who undertakes to read through it exhaustively in the original tongues would have to be a very fluent classicist indeed. At any rate, he would be fluent before he had finished the job.

However, for better or worse, translations of the principal ancient rhetorics are now fairly well in hand. In later periods the difficulty is greater. Medieval rhetoric in direct line of descent from Cicero is rather sparsely represented, but if any of you have not seen W. S. How-



ell's translation of the Rhetoric of *Alcuin and Charlemagne*, together with its introduction, I urge you to look at it, if for no other reason than to see well done what I can only point at in the time allotted to me.

Another important phase of medieval rhetoric, that which stems from St. Augustine and becomes an increasingly imposing set of systematic instructions for writing sermons, is even more sparsely translated.

Sermon rhetoric has been the subject of long continued and distinguished research by Professor Harry Caplan. He has published lists of the materials in this field, including a careful survey of pertinent manuscripts. In a similar vein, Father Thomas M. Charland, of the Institute for Medieval Studies of Ottawa, published his *Artes Praedicandi* in 1936.

One of the sermon rhetorics printed in Latin by Father Charland is *De Modo Componiendi Sermones*, by Thomas Waleys, who was student and later Master of Theology at both Oxford and Paris, and who died in 1350. In 1949 one of Professor Caplan's students at Cornell, Dorothy Evelyn Grosser, presented a translation of the work as her master's thesis. A number of such translations have been made under Professor Caplan's direction, and he has very kindly allowed me to examine some of them, including Miss Grosser's translation of Waleys.

At the risk of disproportion I should like to sketch briefly one aspect of Waleys' work. Imagine a theory of the essay in which three parts are distinguished:

First, the introduction, in which a "theme" is presented. This theme, or "material," must be a scriptural text, and its exact form in scripture may be modified only under strict regulation. The introduction may be organized to present it either narratively or argumentatively,

and the two ways are analyzed in detail.

Second, the theme is "partitioned." Here again there is an elaboration of rules. For example, Waleys says that he can give no absolute and final reason why partition should be limited to any particular number of parts. The preacher can have as many as he wishes. "However," Waleys says, "infinity is abhorred by art as well as by nature."

Another interesting rule, which appears in a number of different applications elsewhere in the book as well as here, has to do with the sources and with the choice of words. The rule is this: each "part" in the partition must be stated in a word or phrase different from the word or phrase with which it corresponds in the text itself. This is the preacher's only opportunity for invention in the ancient sense of the word. He may supply his own words in the partition. These words then function to bring into a fresh relationship the texts and "authorities" of scripture.

The third or principal part of the sermon is the "amplification," which consists in joining authorities, and the sense of the word "joining" here is quite close to its sense as applied to carpenters and cabinet makers. The problem is to amass supporting quotations from scripture and from a few other sources without falling into miscellaneousness. I shall repeat some of the recommended devices for joining authorities: *similitude* ("when one authority in whole or in part is like another in meaning"), *mediation* (that is, the mediation of a third authority), *exposition* or *elucidation* ("when one authority clarifies another"), *definition* (when a word in one authority is defined in another), *description*, *causality*, *specification*, *modification*, *confirmation*, *whole and part*, and *supplementation*. These terms bear a marked resemblance to the ancient "places" or argument, al-

though their meaning is radically different.

In brief, Waleys' theory of rhetoric is a system of rearranging prescribed materials around a set of catalytic terms supplied by the author. And in this system much of the language of ancient rhetoric and logic reappears in radically altered significancies. I have talked of Waleys' theory at some length because it seems to me to force dramatically the requirements of research as I am trying to depict it here—research as the recovery and understanding of old ways of thought and expression.

With regard to the Renaissance, most of you are aware of the work of the late Hoyt Hudson, Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Princeton. I have sometimes wondered whether it was he who prompted the emphasis of the Princeton University Press on materials of this kind. You are aware, too, of his notes and brief translations printed in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, the only journal I know of that has demonstrated any real desire to publish scholarship in rhetoric. I shall have occasion to refer at greater length to Mr. Hudson a little later on, and also to the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*.

With regard to edition and translation, much remains to be done with materials of the Renaissance. I know of no translations in print of the work of the most important rhetoricians of the time, that is, of the French scholar Talon (an associate of Peter Ramus), or of the German Sturmius.

Every rhetorical text up to and including the English Renaissance which has not been edited and, if necessary, translated, is a research assignment. In my opinion, more of them ought to be done. I will allow, however, that the undertaking is a demanding one.

Less pardonable is the obscurity which we have allowed to settle over

later works, many of them in lucid enough English. Perhaps we find them both too immediate and too remote. They seem to belong with the row of publishers' samples that we collect on our shelves. Some of them, I believe, are worth disinterring, if not worth actual editing.

So much for the editorial assignment. If that were all done, the rest would be easier. But research is methodical only within the limits of a single operation. Other things will go ahead while the editors are still getting their ducks in a row.

What are some of these things?

Our old friends sources, influences, and interrelationships certainly comprise an important part of the matter. For an example I return to the work of Hoyt Hudson, particularly to his "Introduction" in his edition of John Hoskins' *Directions for Speech and Style*. Conveniently for Hudson, Hoskins says in his book that he is setting down instruction "taken out of Aristotle, Hermogenes, Quintillian, Demosthenes, Cicero, and some latter, as Sturmius and Talleus, and such honest men." Hudson briefly appraises Hoskins' debt to each of the writers named here, and ventures a few suggestions as to who some of the "honest men" referred to at the end of the list may be. He then remarks on Hoskins' attitudes toward certain notable English rhetoricians who are not mentioned, especially Thomas Wilson and Abraham Fraunce. Out of such affiliations emerge positions, or stances of rhetorical theory, in terms of which agreements and oppositions among various modes of thought defined themselves in Elizabethan times. These stances are historically important.

Having run through Hoskins' obliging list of indebtednesses, Hudson turned his attention to evidences that Hoskins exerted considerable influence on other,

later writers. Ben Johnson quoted from the *Directions* . . . in his *Timber*. Thomas Blount adapted from it extensively in his *Academie of Eloquence* (1654). John Smith used it, by way of Blount, in his *Mysterie of Rhetorique Unvail'd*, which became a popular classroom text.

I have dwelt on Hudson's account of Hoskins' sources and effects because it seems to me to afford another useful paradigm. There is room for many studies of this kind. For example, there is no careful study that I know of of the origins and effects of Richard Whateley, one of the principal 18th-century rhetoricians, or of the relationship in which he stands to Campbell. Similarly, a recent critical study of Jonathan Swift made use of the Port Royal Logic in a way which critics were quick to notice. The study and the critical notices together called attention sharply to the fact that no one was prepared to say what the effect of the Port Royal Logic had been, either in England or elsewhere.

Many of these now dimly remembered books were once familiar to every school-boy. One medium of rhetorical influence, therefore, is that of the classroom. For this reason an interesting by-product of rhetorical research is insight into the history of education. Donald Lemen Clark's book on *John Milton at St. Paul's School* is an example of the sort of thing that I have in mind. Another is an article by Albert Duhamel entitled "Sidney's *Arcadia* and Elizabethan Rhetoric," published in *Studies in Philology* in 1948 (XLV[1948], 134-50).

Some years ago I wrote to Professor T. W. Baldwin asking him a question and expressing my interest in the rhetorical and pedagogical lore he had turned up in connection with his studies of Shakespeare's *Smal Latine*—. He replied in a kindly and helpful way, of course, but he betrayed, I thought, some pique that so much of the mail that he had re-

ceived concerning his book had expressed especial admiration for this phase of his research. He preferred to be appreciated on another score. "I am a student of Shakespeare!" he protested.

Research in literature and research in rhetoric should often overlap, and often they have overlapped. You are aware of the role of the rhetorics in genre studies, studies of character writing, the essay, the epistle, and so on. M. W. Croll, George Williamson, and others have used the rhetorics in their studies of the history of English prose style. There are two students of Renaissance literature whose work I have especially found provocative in this connection. The first is Sister Miriam Joseph, whose study of *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* seems to me most interesting. Her express purpose in this book was no less than "to present to the modern reader the general theory of composition current in Shakespeare's England." The second is Miss Rosemond Tuve, especially her book on *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery*, in which she isolates and defines certain characteristics of rhetorical procedure which I am inclined to accept as historically accurate. The ingenuity with which she balances these procedures against adaptations of them in modern poetry yields one of the interesting overtones of her study.

The distinctive characteristics of the work of these two scholars arise from the fact that in one sense or another they are students of rhetoric, and of its companion discipline, logic. As such, they pose questions and suggest avenues of study in rhetoric, both of the period with which they are concerned and of other periods.

This brings me to the final stage of research.

Beyond all the studies that I have projected there may be a point at which with some hope of success a general history of rhetoric can be undertaken. At

any rate, a compendium may become practicable which would indicate the principal changes which the terms of rhetoric have undergone, together and separately. I should be wiser, however, to include general history among the fields which, either for want of time or want of knowledge, I shall not be able to speak of in detail.

A few things I should like to mention briefly: One is the activity in what I would call the "practical" research carried on under the heading of communications, and which involves many rhetorical ideas, although it uses quantitative, sociological procedures foreign to students of humanistic background. Another is the intense activity for the improvement of international intercourse, essentially a rhetorical problem. This activity seems to me especially awesome in the form given it by certain anthropolo-

gists, who have set out to define the topics of inter-cultural argument on a global basis. A third is the careful study of what we have come to call the mass media—our robot interpreters. Last is the exciting development of contemporary rhetorical theory. I will not attempt a distribution of laurels here. Rather, I should like to say in general that among the journals and books of the past several years there is evidence of profound understanding of what is required for a new and vital conception of rhetoric.

These are valuable activities.

In closing, I deny responsibility for all omissions. Fortunately, you may supply them by reading two articles by Donald C. Bryant ("Rhetoric: Its Functions and Scope") and Lester Thonssen ("Recent Literature in Rhetoric") in the December, 1953, issue of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*.

## Something of Morphemics<sup>1</sup>

GEORGE P. FAUST<sup>2</sup>

The two previous articles of this series have mainly tried to explain (1) that the structural linguists give priority to speech over writing for purposes of analysis and concern themselves with language as a medium of communication, and (2) what the most essential terms in phonemics are and how they are used. The present article will by necessity use the earlier two as background, assuming acquaintance with the phonemes of English and some ability to read phonemic transcription. I hope that is not too forbidding.

As we approach morphemics, new

terms will concern us, but they will seem like so much abracadabra unless the occasion for them is clear. I myself do not see how they could be dispensed with. Again, familiar terms used in new ways are sure to be traps unless the redefinitions of them are observed and absorbed. But as Professor Fries has observed, "The difference between the [structural] approach used here and the older approach lies much deeper than a mere matter of terminology."<sup>3</sup> There should be no worship of terms, nor fear either, for the terms themselves are not central except as they operate as tools. In general, the structuralists seem to care relatively little for the terms and a great deal for accurate definition and consis-

<sup>1</sup> The last of a series of three articles dealing with Structural Linguistics. The first, "Basic Tenets of Structural Linguistics," appeared in *College Composition and Communication* for December, 1953; the second, "Terms in Phonemics," appeared in the February, 1954, issue.

<sup>2</sup> University of Kentucky

<sup>3</sup> *The Structure of English*, Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1952, p. 2.



tent use. What is important is the discovery of a pattern or of a tool, a method, for bringing patterns to light.

MORPHEMICS, which includes everything in language (narrowly defined) from the smallest unit of meaning to the construction of the sentence, takes its name from a useful tool, the morpheme. The first stages of morphemics, up to syntax, are called MORPHOLOGY, and the first two steps in morphology are to identify morphs and classify them. A MORPH can be over-simply defined as an individual linguistic form which is an indivisible unit of meaning. Someone who says 'scramble' has used a morph. It seems to contain several forms—*am*, *ram*, *scram*, *ramble*, *amble*. But if any one of them is taken out, the remainder of the sounds is meaningless. We are forced to conclude that the 'scramble' we heard is indivisible.

Any morph can be recorded as a phoneme or a pattern of phonemes. (Here it should be emphasized that no phoneme *qua* phoneme is a morph. To be a morph, a phoneme must in addition carry meaning.) Suppose you render the line "A rose is a rose is . . ." Each occurrence of *a* /ə/, *rose* /rowz/, and *is* /iz/ is a morph, but the second occurrence is not the same morph as the first, for, strictly speaking, no morph is ever repeated. This only means, of course, that the first pin of the paper is never the second, no matter how much alike they may be.

Determining whether a form is meaningful is a technical process that cannot be described here, but it is important to note that the structuralist does not need to be able to put his finger on the meaning. He only needs to know that it is there. And here is a good place to make, briefly, some distinction between referential meaning, which belongs to semantics, and differential meaning, which is a tool of structural linguistics. Given the knowledge that a form has meaning, it

is important to the linguist to know whether its meaning is "same" or "different" as compared with another form. So, if he hears

'He's still' /hiyz stíl/

on one occasion and

'He's still here' /hiyz stíl híhr/

on another, he will want to find out whether the two forms he has recorded as /still/ are "same" or "different." (As a native speaker, I say, "Different." Do we agree?)

Broadly speaking, structuralists arrive at morphemes by comparing morphs. A MORPHEME can be defined, again over-simply, as a class of morphs that are semantically similar and contrast with morphs belonging to other morphemes. Semantic similarity by itself might gather /red/, /yellow/, and /blw/<sup>4</sup> into one morpheme of color, but since they all contrast before /dres/, say, they belong to different morphemes.

Often there are differences among the members of a morpheme, usually phonemic, and it is useful to recognize subclasses, called allomorphs. An ALLOMORPH consists of like morphs that are in complementary distribution with all other members of their morpheme. For example, English has a morpheme of plurality which has a great many allomorphs. To take the three simplest and most obvious variants, consider *coats* /kowts/, *gloves* /gløvz/, and *dresses* /dresɪz/. In each case a member of the plural morpheme is present, as we can learn from experiment. The forms /s, z, ɪz/ differ phonemically but are in complementary distribution. That is, we do not say /kowtɪz/, and with our training, we probably cannot say /kowtz/. These three, along with many others also in complementary distribution, are set up as allomorphs of the plural morpheme. (The morpheme itself is recorded for

<sup>4</sup> /I/ represents the high central vowel.



convenience as /Z<sub>1</sub><sup>5</sup>; every such "cover symbol" should be described in full somewhere.) *Allomorph* is so convenient a term that even morphemes with a single phonemic shape are said to have one allomorph.

The parallel of *morph*, *allomorph*, and *morpheme* with *phone*, *allophone*, and *phoneme* is obvious. Any morph may be called a morph (i.e., an individual linguistic form which is an indivisible unit of meaning) or an allomorph (i.e., a member of an allomorph) or a morpheme (i.e., a member of a morpheme). If I hear you say "Take your coats," the last meaningful unit, /s/, is a morph that immediately becomes past history. By comparison with other examples of /s/ with the same kind of meaning, I can set up what I think is a class. But a trained structuralist would very soon discover that my supposed class was only a subclass, an allomorph, of a morpheme that has many allophones.

The material considered so far has all consisted of segmental phonemes and has given us SEGMENTAL MORPHEMES. The suprasegmental phonemes produce SUPRASEGMENTAL MORPHEMES, whose meaningfulness is harder for us to grasp, partly—at a guess—because they have only recently been discovered. But apparently it is impossible for us to say anything in English without using at least three morphemes: one segmental, one of stress, and one of intonation (pitch and major juncture).<sup>6</sup> The full phonemic transcription of one way of saying 'Go' is

/<sup>3</sup>gów<sup>1</sup>#/.

One morpheme is the segmental material, /gow/; one is the stress, /<sup>3</sup>/; and one

is the intonation pattern, /<sup>3</sup> 1#/ . The suprasegmental morphemes need not be examined here; their greatest value is in syntactic analysis.

After the morphemes are accounted for, the next step in morphology is to classify the segmental morphemes in what might be called "the grammar of the word." Briefly, the segments can be grouped into BASES, PREFIXES, and SUFFIXES. Bases are usually "free forms" like *sweet*—forms that occur without any prefix or suffix—but some are not, like *-ceive*, which always occurs with a prefix. Prefixes, which like suffixes are never free forms, need no comment. There are two kinds of suffixes, DERIVATIONAL and GRAMMATICAL. Derivational suffixes, like the *-ness* of *coolness*, tend to limit forms to a particular part of speech. (Does this account for our widespread objection to the use of *suspicion* as a verb?) Grammatical suffixes give us the inflections of the few remaining paradigms in English. Disregarding suprasegmental features, the word can now be defined as a single base with or without prefixes and suffixes. By this definition, *incompatibility*, with its single base, is a word; *shotgun*, with two bases, is not. *It is of no linguistic importance that shotgun is written solid.*

The final step in morphology is the establishment of PARADIGMS, which can be viewed as sets of grammatical suffixes. These suffixes follow the base and derivational suffixes (e.g., either *help* or *helpfulness*.) English has paradigms for pronouns, nouns, verbs, and adjectives. In at least the last three, "no suffix" must be recognized as a characteristic ending by contrast with the suffixes used. It is a peculiarity of the language that the noun suffixes for "plural" and "possessive" coalesce when they are both present and the plural morpheme is one of /s, z, ɪz/. Thus we get /widz/ (alongside

<sup>5</sup> For simplicity, the customary brackets for morphemes are not used in this article. The subscript distinguishes the plural morpheme from any others that may have any of the same phonemic shapes.

<sup>6</sup> See G. L. Trager and H. L. Smith, Jr., *An Outline of English Structure* (Studies in Linguistics: Occasional Paper No. 3). Pitch is represented /4 (highest), 3, 2, 1 (lowest)/.

/menz/) where we might have expected /kidziz/.

The paradigm for MORPHOLOGICAL PRONOUNS, a notoriously irregular set, has been the occasion for a good deal of experimenting. The presentation we grew up with emphasizes person, number, gender and case in that order. One of the structural presentations re-works the order to gender, case, person, and number, with really no attention to the last two. The order of cases is also modified to subject, object, 1st possessive, 2nd possessive. Here is the paradigm: *Without Gender*: I, me, my, mine; we, us, our, ours; you, you, your, yours; they, them, their, theirs. *With Gender*: he, him, his, his; she, her, her, hers; it, it, its, —. (Whether the forms of *who* are included is a matter of personal preference.)

The paradigm for NOUNS is: *Common Case*: Sg. (no suffix) /layf/, Pl. (/Z<sub>1</sub>/) /layvz/; *Possessive Case*: Sg. (/Z<sub>2</sub>/) /layfs/, Pl. (/Z<sub>1</sub>/ and /Z<sub>2</sub>/ merged) /layvz/.

The paradigm for VERBS is: *Infinitive and General Present*: (no suffix) /liv/, /rayz/; *3rd Singular Present*: (/Z<sub>3</sub>/) /livz/, /rayziz/; *Past*: (/D<sub>1</sub>/) /livd/, /rowz/; *Past Participle*: (/D<sub>2</sub>/) /livd/, /rizm/; *Present Participle*: ('-ing') 'living,' 'rising.'

The paradigm for ADJECTIVES is: *Positive*: (no suffix) /layv/; *Comparative*: (/ær/) /layvər/; *Superlative*: (/ist/) /layvist/.

The reason for going into the paradigms fully is that they serve as definitions of parts of speech at the morphological level. If an item is inflectible within a paradigm—that is, if it appears with at least two appropriate suffixes (including "no suffix")—it is a member of the part of speech defined by the paradigm.<sup>7</sup> Every item must qualify by this test to be included, which means that *poor* (*poorer*, *poorest*) is a MORPHOLOGICAL ADJECTIVE, but *excellent* remains

unassigned. A MORPHOLOGICAL NOUN is defined as a linguistic item which is inflectible for singular/plural, or for common case/possessive, or for both. Similarly, a MORPHOLOGICAL VERB is inflectible for present/past, etc. *Man* is a noun because of what we write *man's* as well as because of *men*; it is also a verb because of *manned* and other verbal suffixation. What any one occurrence of the form *man* itself may be is a question of assigning it to a paradigm.

Roughly speaking, structural linguistics offers the same list of nouns and verbs as traditional grammar. It is not important why this is so. It is not even important what particular words, like *other* (cf. *others*), are included among nouns, say. What is important is the basis for the classification. We are thoroughly used to a system that often starts with philosophical definitions, and freshmen still know that "A noun is the name of . . ." At this point it is hard for me to see why, *philosophically* speaking, *rain* is not just as much of a noun in 'It rained during the night' as in 'Rain fell during the night.' The difference to me now is purely linguistic. In the first, *rain* has a suffix that belongs distinctly to the paradigm labeled *verb*; in the second, *rains*, with the plural morpheme, can be substituted for *rain* and produce an English sentence.

Structural definitions are no panacea in teaching, but my experience with using them has been encouraging. For the present, students who have mastered traditional grammar had better be left alone, unless they are exceptionally bright. But among those who never

<sup>7</sup> It is not true, as sometimes claimed, that morphological parts of speech cannot be identified without the help of syntax. Without anything to go on but 'Boys will be boys' a linguist could find out from a completely naive informant that *boys* is the plural of *boy*. Contrast 'Fuzz will be fuzz,' or even the homophonous 'Boise will be Boise.' If the linguist already knows that *they* is plural, he can take a short cut by trying 'They will be boys.'

"learned grammar" in high school, I have found some who can match forms more easily than grasp the traditional definitions.

When we leave morphology for syntax, we come to an area where much has been done and much remains to be done. Professor Fries's analysis is so well known and speaks so adequately for itself that I need do no more than allude to *The Structure of English*. The highly technical Trager-Smith *Outline of English Structure*, which I have been more or less following (but any mistakes are mine), is simply unreadable without training in structural linguistics. Yet it has been extraordinarily influential among structuralists, especially for its insistence on a separation of "levels" in analysis and for its report on how we use suprasegmental morphemes to determine constructions.

Separation of levels means, among other things, that parts of speech morphologically defined are not the same as parts of speech syntactically defined. If you hear "Today is Sunday," "Today's paper just came," and "He just came today," you can tell from the forms in the first two that *today* is a morphological noun. But in the second it is in some respects a SYNTACTIC ADJECTIVE, and in the last, fully a SYNTACTIC ADVERB.<sup>8</sup> It is only at the syntactic level that adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, question words (e.g., *when, why, what*), some auxiliaries, and some adjectives can be assigned to parts of speech. To avoid confusion, it is always best to prefix either *morphological* or *syntactic*, whichever is proper, to the name of the part.

Traditional definitions have been by meaning, by form, and by function. Definition by meaning is demonstrably un-

necessary. By the separation of levels, it is now possible to take care of difficulties and confusions growing out of using definition by form and definition by function simultaneously. As a resultant, we may well expect an end of such descriptions as "noun used as adjective" (e.g., in *state highway*) and "noun used as adverb" or "adverbial noun" (e.g., *home* in 'He went home'). If the cleavage between levels were consistently represented in our schoolbooks, I feel sure we would be able to teach it easily.

Suprasegmental morphemes are either SUPERFIXES, patterns of stress with or without plus juncture intervening, or INTONATION PATTERNS, patterns of pitch and major juncture. Several superfixes have been discovered to be "phrase-making":

/'+', /'+', and /'+^/. (/^+' does not make phrases.) Noun compounds have superfixes and are syntactic phrases (e.g., *shotgun*—shót+gùn—which was rejected as a morphological word). 'A blackboard [bláck+bôard] isn't just a black board [bláck+bóard]' illustrates the difference between phrase and non-phrase, and so does 'It's a come-down' (côme+dôwn) in contrast with 'He's come down' (côme+dôwn). Intonation patterns make a number of distinctions, only one of which can be illustrated here. 'He's <sup>3</sup>góing<sup>1</sup>#' uses the commonest morpheme, which can be described as "statement unless qualified by other signals." It contrasts with 'Is he <sup>3</sup>góing<sup>3</sup>||', a pattern associated with questions that use no questionword. ('He's <sup>3</sup>góing<sup>3</sup>||' is a question because of the pattern; 'Where is he <sup>3</sup>góing<sup>1</sup>#' is a question because the pattern is qualified by the use of *where*.) Generally speaking, superfixes apply to phrases, while intonation patterns apply to larger constructions that might be called intonation clauses.

It has proved impossible to cover the ground of morphemics in even a simplified way. My apologies are due the reader for a crowded article which has found

<sup>8</sup> In terminology, the Trager-Smith analysis distinguishes less clumsily, but introduces more new terms: *morphological adjective*=*adjective*; *syntactic adjective*=*adjectival*. There are no *adverbs*—only *adverbials*.

little room to point to applications useful to us as teachers. One thing is reasonably certain, and that is that many uses will be found as we gather a corps of

middlemen—structuralists who know something about our teaching problems and teachers who are at home with structural linguistics.

## The Communication Program at Pace College<sup>1</sup>

CARL LEFEVRE<sup>2</sup>

The basic communication course at Pace College is best understood as part of the nineteen-semester-hour sequence in communication, literature, and speech required for both the B.B.A. and B.A. degrees in the Day and Evening Divisions. Certain materials and techniques are included in (or omitted from) the basic course because of its defined scope, certain others because of its function in the sequence as a whole. For example, we plan to develop the techniques of group discussion in Public Speaking and Group Discussion, a special two-hour course devoted to the work of committees, panels, and symposia. The beginning course is Communication I and II, two semesters of four hours each. Next the student takes a six-hour two-semester course, Masters of English Literature I and II; he may take the group discussion course at the same time or later. During one of his last three semesters, the student takes our Seminar in Oral and Written Reports, a three-hour course in advanced communication techniques; briefly, it is an introduction to problem solving, primarily by means of communication processes such as interviews and questionnaires. We also conduct a referral program known as the Communication Workshop, a college-wide service featuring small-group sessions in writing and speech for stu-

dents who need remedial work at any stage of their college course.

Our English and Communication Department includes ten to twelve full-time and five to fifteen part-time teachers, educated mainly in either English or Speech. Needless to say, these teachers do not have a single, homogeneous opinion on the moot points of composition, communication, speech, grammar, linguistics, workbooks, handbooks, and so on. But through regular staff work, department meetings, and course committees, we usually develop a consensus on each problem and finally incorporate our conclusions in departmental syllabi. Our definition of communication limits the subject to the skills of *verbal* communication, focuses attention on the linkages among them, and points toward as great an integration as possible. Central to our approach to the teaching of these skills is the concept that *thinking* is the crucial element in all verbal communication. We have chosen vital works of modern literature as one of the chief means of stimulating the student to respond and then seek to communicate his response to others in speech or writing; we feel that this method is successful and nicely solves the hard problem of subject matter. Emphasis on the literature of power, along with some of the literature of knowledge, means that we cannot consider the mass media at all in our basic course.

The specific aims of our communication course in terms of development of

<sup>1</sup> This article is the author's condensation of materials originally scheduled for presentation on the program of the final General Session, March 13, 1953, at the Spring Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication in Chicago, Illinois.

<sup>2</sup> Pace College, New York City



the particular skills are succinctly expressed in the following outline, available to the faculty in mimeographed form and implicit in the syllabus. Please bear in mind that for us *thinking* is the principal integrating element binding together the verbal skills of communication. Bear in mind also that we require about twenty per cent of our students to take two hours of preparatory non-credit work in elementary communication, mainly writing.

#### ACHIEVEMENT OUTLINE FOR COMMUNICATION I-II:

Stages in the Development of the Student's Communication Skills: 1) Writing, 2) Reading, 3) Listening, and 4) Speaking

#### COMMUNICATION I MID-TERM:

1. The student has eliminated basic communication failures at the sentence level. He can write 300- to 500- word papers from topic outlines, with adequate paragraph structure and vocabulary.
2. He has read stories and articles and proved his comprehension by writing precis.
3. He has listened to oral presentations and demonstrated comprehension by answering questions or summarizing, orally or in writing.
4. He can read a short paper or give a two- to three- minute speech without excessive stage fright. He can judge simple speeches as to content, organization, and delivery. If the student has any speech difficulty, he should be acquainted with it through hearing his speech on tape and disc.

#### COMMUNICATION I END-TERM:

1. The student has achieved minimum correctness in writing, and has increased his control of sentences and paragraphs. He has made a logical sentence outline and written a 1000-word paper from it.
2. He has read short stories and exposition, and written not only precis, but discussions of ideas and issues encountered.
3. He can listen to an oral presentation of exposition or fiction and not only summarize it but give an adequate opinion in writing or in speech.
4. He has improved in oral exposition of his own materials, and has begun to develop ability to express intelligent criticism orally. His enunciation should be at least adequate, and if he has a speech problem he should have made progress toward solving it.

#### COMMUNICATION II MID-TERM:

1. The student has left basic failures in written communication behind, and as a rule writes good sentences and paragraphs. There begins to be some organic shape to his papers, reflecting more thorough assimilation of materials and better planning.

2. He has read a variety of material, drama especially, studied not as mere text but as dynamic human experience.
3. He can see a play or hear one read, and respond orally or in writing with some insight into meanings and qualities of the experience.
4. He has begun to learn to read aloud, and can present and defend issues arising from reading and discussing essays and plays. Any serious speech difficulty should have been nearly eliminated by this time.

#### COMMUNICATION II END-TERM:

1. The student should be able to write short papers exemplifying "unity, coherence, and emphasis," and to plan and carry out a library investigation to its ultimate conclusion in a good report.
2. He should have demonstrated ability to read, assimilate, and integrate a fairly large mass of material on a chosen subject. His reading of literature should have reached the highest level of his freshman year, with some consideration of poetry.
3. From hearing his classmates' progress reports and summaries of their papers, he should be able in the future to evaluate similar projects, including his own in other courses.
4. He should be able to read aloud and report orally on more advanced matters than the simple personal experiences he was reporting on at the beginning of Communication I. Now he ought to be able to present fairly complex subjects in an expository speech and to read aloud poems of his own choosing.

If he still has any serious speech difficulty, such as a lisp, stuttering, or an undesirable accent, he should receive an Inc (Remedial) until he has solved the problem in the Communication Workshop or elsewhere.

In both Communication I and II we open the semester with an impromptu theme, followed by an "ice-breaker" round of self-introductions to acquaint the students with each other, and to give the teacher maximum familiarity with individual students. The ungraded self-introductory talks, beginning with the instructor, tend to reduce stage fright and establish a rapport in the class which sometimes approaches genuine *esprit de corps* before the semester ends. Time after time students have told me that the warm, friendly atmosphere of the class has meant more to them—and *has helped their communication skills more*—than any other single element of the course.

In the first half of Communication I the student is expected to write about 1200 words in short papers (less than 500



words) and to make a total of four minutes of prepared talks; in the second half, he writes about 1800 words, including a 1000- to 1200-word autobiography or short story, and speaks six minutes. What may be called the core material of this semester is provided by *The Pocket Book of Short Stories*, *The Red Badge of Courage*, and *The Grapes of Wrath*, which we always study along with the excellent film directed by John Ford. In the first semester the student should hear himself at least once on the tape recorder and make one disc recording of a four-minute talk for detailed study and written analysis. My personal conviction is that the single assignment of greatest value to the student is this analysis of his speech recording.

In the first half of Communication II, the student writes about 1500 words, including short library papers, and makes a total of six minutes of prepared talks; in the second half, he writes about 2500 words, including a 1200- to 2000-word library investigation paper, and speaks about eight minutes. The core material of this semester is provided by *The Pocket Book of Verse*, *Death of a Salesman*, and *Pygmalion*, studied along with a film version. The student also makes two disc recordings of four-minute talks, and writes detailed analyses of them.

Obviously the amounts of writing and speaking indicated here are optimum, and cannot always be attained because sections may be too large or the students may need more emphasis on elementary communication problems. The experience of our faculty and students has been that the materials we use give rise to worthwhile thoughts and feelings that demand communication: speaking, writing, listening, reading, and thinking. This is grist to the mill. We also use additional films, film strips, professional recordings, and at the instructor's option, the opaque projector for composition analy-

sis or presentation of pictures and other suitable materials.

Standard books used throughout both semesters include either *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* or *The American College Dictionary*. In Communication I the instructors lecture on the history of the English language and follow this by at least one hour of close work in class with the students' own dictionaries, using some of the excellent orientation and test material provided by the two publishers. We require the students to buy a handbook, but the syllabus provides no specific assignments in it, since we treat it as a reference, leaving to the individual instructor the question of how much class use is needed by any particular section. During the two semesters we assign most of Monroe's *Principles of Speech* as an introduction to speaking and as an aid to outlining both talks and compositions. Holmes and Towle, *The Complete College Reader* (Volume I) provides us with several essays, largely autobiographical, for Communication I, and several provocative essays introducing semantics, logic, and propaganda analysis for Communication II.

So much, then, for specific objectives of our basic communication course, for course materials and implementation. Now perhaps a word is in order concerning the general approach that underlies the course. We intend to reach far outside the classroom, into the student's everyday life. Communication as we see it is not limited to writing and speaking—to expression or self-expression—because it is a social process involving both “sending” and “receiving”; communication denotes *two-way* processes, and in terms of individual psychology suggests the many complex linkages of thinking with all the language skills. In our view, true mastery of communication requires a successful integration of reading, writing, speaking, listening, and *thinking*.

We believe, moreover, that integrated skills cannot be developed separately as well as they can in intimate association with each other, and that no single skill, in itself, will enable a person to communicate successfully in social and professional life. In fact, no single communication skill can be developed to its fullest extent except in co-ordination with the others, because by their very nature they are all linked together in life. Speech and thought are intimately connected from infancy onward, whether we are thinking of the growth of an individual human being or the development of the human race. Indeed, some scholars believe that man's unique development of speech and language is in large part responsible for the evolution of the human brain itself. In any event, speaking and listening develop first, and writing and reading much later—again, whether we are thinking of an individual human life or the life of the race.

To the student this means, among other things, that if he has an inadequate spoken language pattern, the inadequacies of this pattern may be reflected in

his written language; if he mispronounces words, he will probably misspell them. And so on. But most important of all, if his thinking is unclear, his speech and writing will lack that clarity that can have its origin only in clear thought. Accurately "sending" ideas and feelings, as well as accurately "receiving" them from others—communicating with our fellow men—is of the essence of everyday living. Successful communication may be the key to harmonious inter-relationships in business, the professions, and in life itself.

In conclusion, the communication course described here has several advantages. In its synthesizing tendency, it is a distinct departure from traditional composition and speech courses, yet it retains enough familiar features to enable teachers trained in the older disciplines to perform confidently and well in the classroom, to modify and improve their professional techniques gradually, and to make positive contributions of their own to the future development of the course. Finally, the course genuinely appeals to students and administrators.

## The University of Tennessee Program of Training for Teaching College Composition

ALWIN THALER<sup>1</sup>

Unlike Topsy, the Tennessee program did not just grow: after early trial and error, planned and purposive experimentation has helped to shape its development. Some fifteen years ago, to be sure, each of our three or four graduate assistants got his teacher "training" primarily by helping to "correct themes" for a senior member of the staff, by grading a "quiz" now and then, and, occasionally—when his principal was indis-

posed or away on a professional engagement—by pinch-hitting for him; i.e., by giving a pre-arranged quiz, or, more rarely, by teaching the class on his own responsibility. But this was about all—except for one thing more. Originally our assistants were limited to a half-time program of "course" work. (They may now take up to three-fourths of a full program.) The successful ones, disappointed at the end of their first year, while earning their master's degree thus had a two-year exposure—such as it was

<sup>1</sup> University of Tennessee

—to Freshmen and Sophomores. Almost all our University curricula require two years of English, and almost all our instructors regularly teach, besides Freshman Composition, at least one section of English or American literary masterpieces. For many years, therefore, our successive graduate assistants in their second year have had some contact (1) with follow-up procedures in the teaching of composition to sophomore students in English and American Literature; (2) some cumulative hints as to the vital relations between the teaching of Composition and Literature.

During the last ten years, our situation has changed and our training program has taken fairly definite form. It is administered by our Committee on Graduate English Studies, which, through its chairman, works in close collaboration with the chairmen of the Department and of the Freshman and Sophomore staffs. Two familiar conditions have had to be reckoned with. First, we have increasingly recognized our local share of responsibility for training promising recruits for our profession. And we feel strongly that this training should come from the subject-matter departments rather than from the colleges of education. Second, our growing program for the Ph.D. in English, and the post-war inrush of students, inevitably multiplied our graduate enrollment and problems. During the last four or five years we have appointed, each year, approximately ten or twelve "graduate assistants" (A. B.'s, most without teaching experience) and six "teaching assistants" (M.A.'s, including some experienced teachers, each normally given full teaching responsibility for one freshman section). As a rule, but by no means invariably, two-thirds of the total have been graduate assistants, the rest teaching assistants. All of these student assistants participate in the regular departmental meetings and especially in

Freshman Composition staff (round-robin-testimonial) sessions on the correction and grading of themes and other teaching problems. For our graduate assistants we have set up the following three-way training program:

1. Each graduate assistant is assigned to assist a senior staff member who is especially responsible for this student's teacher training. The student "assists," first of all, literally: by *attending regularly all sessions of one of his adviser's Freshman sections*. Thus he comes to know the students and, subject to his own critical observation and inquiry, at least one mature teacher's method.

2. Each graduate assistant increasingly participates in—and, in time, assumes partial responsibility for—regularly assigned conferences with individual students. Thus, and by classroom observation, he learns to help students plan and correct papers, and to watch individual progress.

3. Each graduate assistant, usually toward the end of *each* quarter, is given full teaching charge of his section for one week—three consecutive recitations. The professor in charge, if desired, advises him in planning these recitations, attends them, and offers constructive criticism. Thus each graduate assistant has the opportunity to try himself in three weeks of actual teaching each regular academic year. (A proposed amendment of this procedure is to allow a graduate student who has done well in his late *first-quarter* teaching to pick it up again *early in the second quarter*—to give him the benefit of the carry-over.)

We know all too well, of course, that our program has its limitations. For example, we have made no systematic provision for those graduate students—more than half our total—who hold no assistantships. Many of these, however, are not planning to teach, and others are un-

certain or unlikely. For those who are likely, we hope to provide occasional practice teaching as we can. Again, though some of us in our time took courses in the teaching of college composition under distinguished teachers, we offer no such course to our students. We have open minds on the subject, but

for the present we think our plan better fits the needs of our graduate students. They like it. Regularly some of the better graduate assistants move up to teaching assistantships, now and then to a full instructorship. This incentive is especially useful. By and large, we think our program works.

## Sentence Structure as Style

VIOLA K. RIVENBURGH<sup>1</sup>

"You have a style of your own. Whether you realize it or not your sentence patterns are as individual as you are," I told my class in third term freshman composition.

"With a little diagnosis of your writing, you will find that the length and kind of sentences you write may not only give it away as being yours, but indicate how you compare with the average college freshman. Let us see how."

To arouse a compelling interest in my students to overcome their individual writing faults I have often used the following project successfully. I first explain that as a student progresses through grade and high school his sentence length increases from a little over four words in the fourth grade to about eighteen when he finishes high school. University freshmen, including those tested in my own classes from year to year, average 19.9 to 20 words per sentence. As a student progresses toward adulthood he should write longer sentences, and more of the complex type; he should vary his sentence patterns. Through carelessness or laziness, however, most college freshmen have got into a rut.

"For instance," I remark as I hand back the composition the students have written during the preceding class period, "When you examine your class paper,

several of you will find that you run to the short and simple type of sentence; one or two of you will observe that you enjoy using the semicolon with the result that the compound sentence predominates; some of you run to run-ons."

Mr. Green, who has been dozing in the back seat, suddenly becomes alert. The hoped-for general interest is now apparent; students are eager to ascertain something about their own style and to find how they compare with other college freshmen.

As a first step I ask them to count all the words in their class paper noting down the number in each sentence; to find their shortest, their longest; to compute the average number of words per sentence; to find the number of simple, of compound, of complex sentences; the number of loose and of periodic; to note whether sentences follow normal or inverted order. Most students finish computing sentence lengths in about fifteen minutes and silently take stock of their own writing habits. I suggest that they complete the exercise and write a paragraph or two regarding their findings, bringing these and their class paper to the next meeting of the class. This they find easier after our class discussion.

My next step is to ask several students whose sentence tendencies vary widely to read their papers.

"Well, Mr. Green," I suggest, "would

<sup>1</sup>University of Washington



you like to read your class paper and see if we can discover what you found out about your writing?"

Mr. Green, whose fondness for the particular sentence pattern I had noted, had often volunteered to read his work and was pleased to have his paper discussed. After he had finished reading, he was surprised when the class commented upon his tendency to unvaried, overlong sentences, the compound type predominating, which resulted in dullness of style and monotonous sentence rhythm. The guess that the average number of words per sentence was well over twenty was accurate. The suggested ways of securing better sentence patterns showed Mr. Green what he needed to avoid.

Miss Brighton, some of whose excellent and entertaining home papers I had read to the class, was asked to read her composition. As she did so, I could see that students were silently making comparisons. Could it be that Miss Brighton's ability to manage the sentence was one of the influencing factors in securing the A grades on her papers? How much of this ability might be innate in a student, how much a learned technique?

When the reading had been completed, it was quite obvious to the poorest student that Miss Brighton had profited by the suggestions of her teachers and the exercises we had been doing in the three terms of freshman composition. Innate originality was evident, but the students themselves noted that some care had been used to vary the length and pattern of sentences even in rapid class writing. The result, with the inclusion of one or more suspense-creating periodic sentences among the other types, was a pleasing rhythmic pattern and a sustained reader interest.

Before the period ended the students suggested the best method for revision

of the comma faults too noticeably prevalent in the writing of one of the students; how to link a series of overshoot sentences in that of another, all of which exercise fixed points in their minds no amount of lecturing could. The class saw easily the effectiveness of variation of sentence length: that short sentences may be used for emphasis; that overlong sentences tend to be unrhythmical. Since but one subject had been assigned for the class writing, discussion brought out the interesting variations in sentence treatment, in introduction, and in transition devices: in short, what is meant even in an elementary way as style. The value of reading a composition aloud as a check for the foregoing points was also commented upon.

Some students do not show any very obvious sentence trend in the examination of one class paper. I usually find a follow-up analysis at a later class period very helpful when I may pass out for examination a home paper written earlier, or ask the students to work on the rough draft of a research paper in the last stages of revision. At this time I have found the exercise has numerous virtues. It stimulates a flagging interest at a point when students often resort to plagiarism; it has helped them avoid parroting of sources evident in sentence patterns too obviously different from their own, or a patchwork effect when too many short sentences from different sources were not worked together successfully in their own words into an integral whole.

Since the project I have outlined has proved helpful in all three terms of freshman composition, it may be varied in numerous ways to meet a class requirement at any given time. Sometimes the analysis may be extended to include examination of individual paragraph or diction as well as sentence trends. The



main point, regardless of the variation used, is that the project has had numerous informative values as well as being an almost sure way of arousing interest in students difficult to reach with the usual teaching devices. After this interest has been aroused they are more likely to try to develop what they find to be commendable in their own writing tech-

nique, to eliminate what is bad. When a class paper written on the same subject is analyzed, members of the class become aware that no two papers are ever alike, and that there are as many ways of saying something about a subject as there are students; that each has his own writing technique and individual sentence patterns.

## Ibid and Like That

ALISON WHITE<sup>1</sup>

After trying to explain the construction of an investigative paper, I asked the class whether there were any questions. "Yes," came a voice from the seat nearest the door: "Do you mean *ibid.* and like that?" This magic phrase brought what seemed almost a brightness upon the class, and it occurred to me that to a freshman the easy use of learned tags confers a sense of the initiate. "This is research," he congratulates himself in surveying his *Habits of the Ants* or *History of Textiles*. For has it not *loc. cit.*?

Heady with *ibids.*, the freshman scholar will resist advice to narrow his subject. Travail of that sort takes the kick out of a project that impresses him most in its accessories and adornments. Hasn't he, the toiler, amassed cards and indices; set up that imposing structure, a bibliography; provided notes bearing or borne up by Latinic labels? The dawn of scholarly pride may have come in what a student probably thinks of as the packaging of his product; girt as it is from title page to appendix, the product itself should be big. As topics *The History of Musical Instruments*, *World Wars I and II* have scope to match their props. At best, too, the writing of a research paper is a formidable prospect to a freshman, and he may see a hope of safety in the

rehashing of some venerable topic which is as remote from his instructor's experience as his own. At the command to narrow his topic he shows panic and very often, escape artist that he is, wriggles out without complying. His subject broadens and goes flat; its thesis fades. The result is yet another half-hearted typescript of reading-card jottings, weighted with footnotes as with barnacles. Any instructor sees how vicious this is: an inflated and specious thing tricked out in Latin tags. He tells the hopeful writer this bad news. Let down in his defeat, the student takes solace in having coped with the mechanics of documentation, but no subject has come alive in his mind. The reward of even the humblest research is denied him.

The investigative paper is costly in time and effort. It ought to bring to its author an accession of new strengths. These might come through the struggle to limit a subject and secure it to a central, energizing thesis. As the battlefield for such good warfare is the student's divided mind, he finds it fatiguing and hard to sustain. And if his subject and the approach he makes to it have no connection with his inner life, a beginner probably cannot key himself to the resourcefulness that he will have to muster. Can a first venture into research be tied to the heart and will? Can it be

<sup>1</sup>Indiana University

made to serve as imaginative or autobiographical writing often does: to yield to its student author not information merely, but illumination? Such a question has scope, and the teacher of English composition may think it too majestic for his occasion. The student, however, because he expects the investigative paper to be his most ambitious composition to date, is at his most educable—up to the moment when the project turns sour because his will flags and fails. To prevent this, can a teacher find out some deep need, common to student writers, that can be appreciably met in a few weeks of reading and writing?

As I was pondering this, one answer came during a class discussion of connotation and denotation. The textbook account drew its quotations from articles published in the middle of the 1940's. As I saw what trouble the students were having with this, I polled the class on the meaning of such keywords there as *Quisling* or *Munich* (as event). No freshman recognized these. Only three out of the twenty-five understood *Fifth Columnist*. References to Franklin Roosevelt's diction and voice roused no echoes, even among the children of Democrats. I reflected then that these freshmen were perhaps eight years old when Roosevelt died, five at the time of Pearl Harbor. Before they could read, the Depression had softly and suddenly vanished away. Yeats had become his admirers; and if Shaw was Methuselah to this late-sprung generation, so was Hemingway. What is it like to have been in the fourth grade at the beginning of the Atomic Age? Clearly, what young students have in common is their youth. A common need is to fill in certain terms and facts, the knowledge of which is assumed in current publications and talk. When college freshmen join their elders as readers and listeners, they suffer from a natural ignorance of what was done or reported a

decade ago. In general talk and writing, the horizon of reference extends backward through one, if not two, wars. Much casual expression must sound like doubletalk to a youth approaching draft age. *Quisling*, *Munich*, *Fifth Column* pose riddles, and the urge to unriddle these and their like is very strong because they impose embarrassment of the sort known to the traveller. Mere definition will help but little. What the student needs is an "acquired memory" of events recent to his elders, but below his horizon or recollection.

Might a few weeks' work in simple research help to bring freshmen abreast of the adult world by putting them into touch with what is preserved of its recent past in every college—even in every township—library? As a preparation for the selection of subjects for research, I put three classes, during two semesters, through the experience of leafing through bound magazines and papers to find out what they needed to learn. Each student wrote a short paper, proposing topics that he found attractive, and giving some account of the material he had found useful. These were read in class, and there was no ban upon any member's adopting another's subject. In class discussions, students compared *lacunae* and *desiderata*. Conferences followed for the construction of outlines, and, as the talk progressed, each writer formulated his controlling or energizing "thesis." In every instance the motive was to remedy the recency of a student's impressions and to make some attempt to see how these had been accumulated. The heart and will were thus engaged, for the young will go through a good deal to fit themselves for emergence into adult life, as the student market for etiquette manuals attests.

By requirement, no sources were used but those to be found in periodicals and newspapers. The students' choice of sub-

jects for the investigative paper indicating the degree to which they had been baffled as readers, listeners, and hopeful participants in general conversation. An urge to come abreast of the general reading and talking public was betrayed in student interest in famous trials: Hiss, Lindbergh, Loeb-Leopold, Scopes. Some writers were impelled to discover the New Deal in terms of its contemporary reports. The Depression was a popular subject. Students observed its course by remarking its effects upon magazine editorials, fiction, correspondence columns, jokes, and cartoons through the 1930's. Rationing during each of the two World Wars, the draft as reported at the beginning of each war, and press reactions to the start of the Korean War were considered, not without astonishment. A popular choice was that of comparing views on child rearing of twenty or thirty years ago with those held now. The coronation of Queen Elizabeth II was compared with those of her ancestors. Operas since 1940, French or Italian films, accounts of sculpture and paint-

ing in the era between the wars, balanced a popular leaning to *Sports Personalities of the Nineteen-Twenties* (or *Thirties, Forties*) or *Strategies in Post-War Fashion Change*. A literary minority surveyed the run of critical commentary in the quarterlies, fixing upon some such fashionable subject as Dostoevsky, Melville, or James. Medical innovations were followed up, in an agreeable kind of sleuthing by hindsight, to discover which had survived the innovations that succeeded them. Miracle drugs, best-sellers, flying saucers found their historians. A study in changing styles of humor brought solemn findings, weighted with statistics, from the pages of the old *Life* and the *New Yorker*.

To all appearances, student interest was now centered in the body of the work, not in its sideshow aspects of documentary props. It seems probable, too, that such dipping into the decades that lie just below the horizon of memory yielded a beginning of what is to be hoped for: a context for *now*.

## NSSC News

DONALD E. BIRD<sup>1</sup>

Featured in the March issue of *The Journal of Communication* is an article by Major Kenneth B. Clark, president of the National Society for the Study of Communication, entitled "What Does NSSC Actually Do, and How?"

Clark lists five functions of the organization: (1) to collect information and data about communication and the communication process and make them available to interested persons; (2) to provide concrete guidance and assistance to persons working on problems of com-

munication; (3) to develop programs on communication at the meetings and conventions of the society and other interested organizations; (4) to bring together persons from diverse fields who share a common interest in communication in order to increase the common fund of applicable knowledge about the communication process; and (5) to identify existing communication problems and the appropriate agencies or individuals to solve them.

Each of these functions is carried on through specific activities of the organi-

<sup>1</sup> Stephens College

zation. The *Journal*, the *News Letter*, and the Information Distribution Center are the media through which information about communication is collected and distributed. The services of Consultation Teams and special committees are available to assist persons working on communication problems and programs.

Typical of the third function of NSSC was the sponsorship of five meetings on communication at the Central States Speech Association convention in Chicago on April 2 and 3. Dr. Max Fuller, member-at-large of the National Council of NSSC, was responsible for the organization of the communication sessions. Chairmen of individual meetings were: Earnest Brandenburg, Washington University; E. H. Reed, International Harvester Company; Harvey Overton, Battle Creek, Michigan; Donald E. Bird, Stephens College; and Charles S. Goetzinger, Purdue University. The themes of the sectional meetings were: "Research in Communication," "Communication in Business and Industry," "Problems and Methods of Developing a Communications Course in Your High School," "What's New in College Communication Courses?," and "Projects and Problems in Industrial Communication Research."

People from many different areas of life are brought together by their common interest in the improvement of human communication through the operation and activities of NSSC. For example, among the speakers at the communication meetings referred to above were: C. David Cornell, Adjutant General's School, Fort Benjamin Harrison, talking on "Some Results of Shifts from Lecture to Discussion Teaching"; George Port, Training Section, E. I. duPont de Nemours & Company, reporting on the "Discussion Leading" program presented to the management of the company; Arthur Angrist, Coordinator of Education, The Philco Corporation, summarizing a re-

search study on "Communications of Executives in Business and Industry;" and Clyde Dow, Michigan State College, talking on "Critical Listening."

Whenever a special communication problem is identified, it is assigned to one of the fifteen study and research committees or made the mission of a special committee. Such an effort to work on special problems of communication is exemplified by the recent appointment of the Committee on Aid to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service under the chairmanship of Herold Lillywhite, former president of NSSC.

Similarly, according to Clark, the standing Study and Research committees derive their goals and functions from the functions of the organization as a whole. Within its particular area, be it Reading Comprehension, Communication in Government, Intercultural Relations or whatever, each committee has its contribution to make to each of the five organizational functions. Each individual active member, in turn, has a responsibility for carrying on the functions of the society within his own immediate environment.

To make its purposes and organization more widely known, NSSC has recently prepared for distribution a descriptive brochure. The *raison d'être* of the organization is stated thus: "There is a growing awareness of the need for better communication in our world. When communication is poor within or between organizations of men, inefficiency, misunderstanding and conflict often result." Therefore, "Ways must be found to overcome barriers to the successful sharing of thoughts between foreman and worker, doctor and patient, lawyer and client, teacher and student, husband and wife—and between these individuals and the larger groups of which they are a part; industry, labor, the professions, education, community and government."



# Measuring Success in Composition<sup>1</sup>

J. GORDON EAKER<sup>2</sup>

The art of writing reflects so intimately the personality of the writer, and is subject to so many interpretations on the part of readers, that one might feel that no one way of measuring success in composition could command universal agreement. Yet we agree that many students cannot write clearly, and when they are sent to us for instruction, we are compelled to set up a certain outline of fundamentals to be mastered and to define a certain minimum standard to be attained. This involves grading on the application of these fundamentals in themes. But we are often subjective or individualistic in our grading. Furthermore, we have to decide as fairly as possible whether to admit students to college in the first place or not, and if so, what level of instruction they need. And if the high schools are sending students to us who are poorly prepared, we feel that we should help the high schools to do a better job. The satisfying of all these needs demands objective, standardized tests in English composition.

Our committee's first effort was to learn the extent and nature of uniform tests available and the uses being made of them by colleges in this area. A questionnaire to departmental chairmen aimed to discover these facts. In the twenty departments that replied, the most popular objective test is the Cooperative English Test, which was mentioned by 7 of the 20 colleges. Other tests mentioned were the Iowa and Purdue placement tests, and, at the recent Conference on College Composition and Communication in Chicago, the Ohio State test and

the Barrett-Ryan test were mentioned. Several colleges use their own tests.

As to the uses being made of the tests, 11 of the 20 colleges use uniform tests for placing students in freshman composition; 9 do not. One college used a standardized test for some years but gave it up on finding the students' high school averages equally reliable. Three colleges use uniform tests for admitting or accrediting students who have studied composition in other colleges or in the armed services; 17 of the 20 do not. Apparently the chief use of objective tests at present is for placement.

A second use of objective tests is for maintaining standards among instructors and among colleges. Eight of the 20 colleges have used them for maintaining standards among instructors; 12 have not. Only 5 chairmen, however, said that they had noticed any influence from their use. Two had not noticed any influence of the tests on standards, and 13 did not answer this question. Five colleges have used tests to compare their achievement with that of other colleges; 15 have not. Of course, any standardized test, by definition, compares a student's achievement with that of other students everywhere, for the norms are usually based on returns from thousands of students and enable one to scale any score at a glance.

As to the value of tests in maintaining standards, 10 of the 20 chairmen think that the use of uniform tests does assist in maintaining standards in composition in high schools and colleges. Only 2 did not, though 9 others would not say yes and expressed doubt. One said that he is not sure that they really measure composition. Eight of the 20 report that their colleges are trying in other ways to influence the high schools. Eleven have

<sup>1</sup>This paper was part of the report of the Committee on Composition Tests to the New York Council of College Teachers of English, May 16, 1953.

<sup>2</sup>Jersey City Junior College

done nothing; one is studying proposals. Tests, of course, are one way of influencing high school standards.

High school and college teachers are somewhat skeptical about the value of objective tests in composition. In response to our question as to whether college instructors object to uniform tests or not on the grounds that they hamper the instructor's freedom to do what he can do best, 6 departmental chairmen said yes, to 7 who said no. Seven gave no answer. Apparently opinion is about equally divided.

The present College Entrance Board test in English composition is of the objective or semi-objective type; that is, the material is so constructed that the students have little latitude in answering the various parts of the test. It is thus only an indirect measure of writing ability and is based on the assumption that this ability can be measured through a student's capacity to recognize good writing and to correct improperly written passages. The Board turned to this type of test about five years ago when it became convinced that an essay test taken by 20,000 to 30,000 students from all over the country could not be graded reliably by the large number of readers required. The Board conducted an exhaustive statistical analysis of the one-hour essay test in English composition in 1947 and reluctantly concluded that it was not an appropriate instrument for admissions purposes. The College Entrance Board, of course, is interested in only one aim, predicting success in college. English teachers have to go on from there.

Even so, in response to the demands of teachers, the College Entrance Board has continued to experiment with essay testing in the hope that some substantial improvement could be made in this type of test. The latest experiment is the General Composition Test, a two-hour writing exercise described by Earle G. Eley,

Examiner in Humanities at the University of Chicago, in the *College Board Review* of November, 1951. This test provides background reading materials to accompany the essay problem. The College Entrance Board is in a period of uncertainty with respect to a test of composition. They are using an objective instrument which is satisfactory from a statistical point of view but which does not have the support of teachers in English. They are considering an instrument which is not entirely satisfactory from a statistical point of view but which does have the strong support of teachers of English. This indicates a certain psychological problem with respect to objective tests on the part of many teachers.

The common argument against objective tests is that instructors teach more than is measured by the test. Let us be thankful that they do; but a good test will still measure certain fundamentals that everyone should teach. At the recent CCCC meeting in Chicago there was a feeling on the part of many that a theme should be used in conjunction with objective tests. The workshop on "National Entrance Tests and Minimum Standards" recommended, first, that the concept of "minimum essentials" should not be limited to mechanics and usage but should include the ability to focus an idea and to select and organize supporting material around the idea. Secondly, this group recommended that the CCCC appoint a committee to work with the various testing agencies in order to develop tests that will reflect this expanded idea of minimum essentials, that will more effectively serve as instruments for diagnosing individual needs and providing reliable bases for sectioning, and that will help to achieve a greater uniformity of standards throughout the country.

A modern objective test can teach us to improve our instruction. For example,

the ability to read prose critically and to observe how the ideas are put together must teach steps in the art of composition. A writing test should probably include a reading test as a major ingredient. The Cooperative English Test has gems of reading selections and anecdotes, carefully hunted out by experts, with multiple-choice questions over their interpretation. Such discipline surely aids the attention and strengthens the memory. Unless one reads critically, one cannot be expected to write carefully.

Secondly, objective testing of the mechanics of grammatical usage, punctuation and capitalization, and spelling is so common that one need not labor its usefulness, especially for retarded sections. But from the Cooperative English Test's third portion on Effectiveness of Expression, even the advanced student can learn. Good English style is largely dependent on effective sentences. In the test, the student must compare parallel versions and choose the better sentence for each idea. Next, the student's choice of diction is tested by having him pick out the one word from five possible words for a given context. Organization is tested by the common device of the scrambled passage, where the questions on the order of sentences are sub-divided to give the student credit for understanding some of the relationship of ideas if not all. Organization is further tested by having the student supply missing sub-heads in an outline by choosing each time among five possibilities. All of these abilities, it seems to me, should be taught by a good composition teacher.

These elements combine to make up the Cooperative English Test, which is strictly objective, with all the advantages that that entails. In addition, the Educational Testing Service has devised a compromise between the essay test and the objective test in the form of an interlinear test. A poorly written passage

is printed on every other line, and the student is asked to revise it. This closely approximates the classroom situation in which a student must revise the first draft of his composition before handing it in, or the situation in which the teacher presents portions of a student essay to a class for their suggested improvements. These revisions are not hard to grade, for the poor constructions are blocked off on a key with the correction indicated. Uncalled for changes by the student are disregarded to keep the grading uniform. This type of test makes up Part II of the present College Entrance Board test. It may be objected that this is a mere test of proof-reading. But should English scholars disparage "mere proof-reading"?

These examples, together with a specimen "Reading and Writing Test" prepared by Dr. Paul B. Diederich, of which extra copies are available, show that the construction of a good test for writing competence is a distinct possibility, if we do not already have such a test. Our committee was asked to discover such a test, with the thought that a recommendation for a city-wide testing program might follow. Such a program might be started by five or six colleges whose departments are willing to cooperate. Dr. Diederich suggests that we give the same test at the beginning of the freshman year for placement or diagnosis and repeat the test at the end of the year to measure improvement. The scores of entering students might be sent to the high schools from which they come. In anticipation of the test at the end of the year, both instructors and students could point their efforts toward the objectives to be tested. This should insure mastery of certain minimum essentials and supply the powerful motive of the intent to learn. I hope that some such testing program can be started next year.

In conclusion, let us say that tests are

good for placement and for diagnosis. They are a means of keeping a department together in teaching the minimum essentials. They provide a way of cooperating with the high schools in maintaining standards. They are not intended as a substitute for a good teacher, for wide reading, for constant practice in writing, or for conferences. They do not teach creative writing or how to write a research theme. Nor should we expect

testing to lead to the establishment of national entrance requirements. The colleges will probably continue to take students where they find them and do for them what they can. But a testing program, participated in by several colleges and making use of the best modern techniques, might help us to approach a certain standard of writing competence, both in high schools and colleges.

## CCCC Bulletin Board

**PLEASE NOTE:** In late April, 1954, the headquarters of The National Council of Teachers of English moved to 704 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois. Since the NCTE is business headquarters for the Conference on College Composition and Communication, with the NCTE Executive Secretary, J. N. Hook, the Treasurer of the CCCC, the business address of CCCC has also changed to 704 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois. All orders, renewals, and other business correspondence should therefore be sent to the Champaign address. The editorial address remains as it was: University Hall, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

The spring meeting, 1955—i.e., next spring's CCCC meeting—will be held in Chicago, Illinois, at the Hotel Morrison. The dates are Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, March 24, 25, 26. The Program Chairman for the meeting is Irwin Griggs, present Assistant Chairman of the CCCC, of Temple University, Philadelphia 22, Pennsylvania. He would like your answers, brief or detailed, to the following questions:

1. What is your opinion of the value of the workshop meeting?

2. What topics would you recommend for panel discussions?
3. What topics or speakers would you recommend for general sessions?
4. Do you have any other general or particular recommendations?

The sixth annual Midwestern English Conference, with representatives from Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois, met at the Indiana University Center at Kokomo, Indiana, on Friday and Saturday, April 2 and 3, 1954. The general theme was "Bridging Gaps—How may we strengthen various articulations for a more realistic approach in our teaching?" After two panel discussions on "A Realistic Approach to Composition and Communication" and "Literature Teaching Based on Students' Abilities, Interests, and Needs," there were three work groups on each of these subjects.

*Motivation for students in reading, writing, and speaking:* "Perhaps when a manufacturer of turbines, generators, jet engines, lamps, room air coolers, toasters, refrigerators, and 200,000 other electrical products says English is of tre-



mendous importance, they (students) will listen. After all, English is almost as important as math in our business, isn't it?

"The engineer's answer is deliberately emphatic: 'Change the word *almost* to *just*, and, brother, you've said a mouthful! Tell them that English is important to them—and to us—because very soon their ability to read and to know and to remember what they have read, and to speak and to write well, will make all the difference, whether they and we or some other company of their career choice will succeed together.'" — General Electric Company: "General Electric's Answer to . . . Why Study English?"

Among the book "reviews" in the Autumn, 1953, *The Use of English* (a quarterly for teachers of English in British schools—see *Composition and Communication* for October, 1953) are reviews of the last four 1952 issues of *The English Journal* and the last three 1952 issues of *College English*. The reviewer concludes as follows:

"*The English Journal* and *College English* have this in common—that the contributors' standards of English expression are in the main high. One does not know to what extent the articles have been touched up at editorial level, but it is certain that the writing in general is unambiguous, direct, and above all free from signs of that stiffness and self-consciousness which sometimes afflict the teacher of English in this country—the lecturer too, for that matter—when he comes to 'take up his pen'."

*College English* for December, 1953, contains "A Bibliography of Audio-Visual Aids for Courses in American Literature" (films, film-strips, records, tape-recordings) by Sister Mary Brian, O.P. This is a complement to Virginia Wallace's "Audio-Visual Aids for a Survey Course in British Literature," *College English*, October, 1951. Extremely useful and valuable would be a bibliography of audio-visual aids for courses in composition and communication.

## Correspondence

### The Place of "Mass Communications" in a Curriculum

I should like to ask a question and I know of no better place to ask it than in a publication widely read by educators primarily concerned with writing courses taught on the college first-year level.

My question really amounts to a request for help in analyzing data that were gathered as a part of survey of the teaching of journalism in American teachers' colleges. As part of the survey, 185 presidents of teachers' colleges answered the following question:

"In your opinion, should the under-

standing of and the ability to use mass communications media (such as radio, newspapers, movies, television, etc.) be taught on the college level in one or more of the following ways . . . ?"

Forty-nine presidents thought such instruction should be part of regular freshman composition courses.

Forty-six thought a separate course in "mass communications media" should be provided for upper division students.

Forty-four thought "mass communications media" should be a journalism course.

Forty-four thought a course in "mass communications media" should supplant

one of the regular freshman composition classes.

Other suggestions for handling such instruction were made by the following numbers of presidents: a special English course in "mass communications media," 16; a special social science course in "mass communications media," 10; a special speech course in "mass communications media," 3; a special, required general education course in "mass communications media," 3; a special radio course in "mass communications media," 2; as a part of several courses, 2; a part of both English and social science courses, 2; a special education course for prospective English teachers, 1; an elective course for any level, 1; a special advertising course in "mass communications media," 1; a special audio-visual aids course in "mass communications media," 1; as extra-curricular club activity, 1.

Altogether the presidents made 172 suggestions that would involve maintaining a complete, separate course in "mass communications media," and sixty suggestions that such instruction be included as part of other courses. Only three presidents said they felt "mass communications media" instruction was too insignificant to be worthy of inclusion within their colleges' curricula. Indeed, the presidents generally agreed that the instruction would justify attention in several areas of the curriculum.

One president pointed out that such a course should include a laboratory using available commercial equipment and facilities. Another president thought the college's approach would have to vary with its overall curricular pattern. Dr. Leonard S. Duncan, dean of instruction at the State Teachers College of Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania, remarked:

Journalism is merely one method of communicating ideas. The emphasis should be placed upon power to communicate—by whatever means

seem suited to the need of the occasion. All English, speech, and journalism should fall under the general head of "communications." Art and music and visual aids are also communication media. I don't like a separate course. It should become part of an integrated program in communications.

Dr. Herbert L. Cushing, president of Nebraska State Teachers College of Kearney, Nebraska, added his objections:

I may explain my answer by saying that I do not favor adding new courses every time a new development comes along. To wit: I do not care for courses in the grades, in the secondary school or in the college, such as "Air Age Education." I would include it in a unit as a part of geography, or physics, or wherever it properly belonged—just as thrift education would be a part of arithmetic or economics. I believe in revising courses to accommodate new content but I do not believe we need atomic age education, rocket age education or television age education as such.

Dr. W. D. Armentrout, vice-president of Colorado State College of Education at Greeley, Colorado, said (during an interview in the summer of 1951) that he, too, objected to the addition of many new courses to the curricula of high schools or colleges, yet pointed out that many colleges do not provide training in "mass communications media" for prospective high school teachers to use such material as units in already established courses.

Directly in contrast to these viewpoints were reports from other teachers' colleges that had found instructors willing and eager to teach "mass communications media" in some way. The State Teachers College at Indiana, Pennsylvania, had a required course which sup-

planted freshman composition and urged students to take electives in radio and journalism. The State Teachers' College at St. Cloud, Minnesota, offered a third quarter course in its freshman communications sequence devoted to mass communications media. It was required of all students, and journalism minors and language arts majors were required to take a junior year level course offered by the journalism department in mass communications media.

The president of Northeast Missouri State Teachers College at Kirksville, Missouri, explained his viewpoint thus:

It is my judgment that mass communications media should be taught on the college level. I would organize a course for freshman students that would be required for all. I would call this course "Communications." In this course I would deal with such matters as oral and written communication along with mass communications methods, such as radio, newspapers, magazines, movies, etc. As these various communications were taught, grammar and good English usages would be stressed in a practical way. Such courses would take the place of the traditional courses that are so often referred to as "Freshman Composition" or "Freshman English."

Data in the survey (which covered the 1951-1952 college year) indicated that at least 29 teachers' colleges were offering courses outside their journalism departments which dealt with mass communications media. These courses are not to be confused in any way with freshman communication courses dealing with individual activities in reading, writing, speaking, or listening that have been adopted in place of the older freshman composition courses. The survey indicated that some college presidents did confuse the two types of "communication" approaches.

In view of the wide-spread approval of "mass communications media" instruction among the presidents of America's teachers' colleges, I must ask what the significance of such approval might be. How would the inclusion of such instruction in freshman writing courses be possible? Or would it be advisable? Further, would it be advisable to supplant existing courses with new "mass communications media" courses? Or would such a course be a worthy companion to existing courses?

Frankly, the questions I raise are sincere and I believe the urgency for answers is becoming greater each college year.

LOUIS E. INGELHART  
Ball State Teachers College

## Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication

In "The Survival of the English Teacher" (*Etc.: A Review of General Semantics*, Winter, 1953) Lee Deighton questions whether the traditional emphasis on grammar in English instruction can be justified in relation to the life needs of students. He realizes the importance of

the study of structure as an indispensable means of dealing intelligently with language, but he objects to the study of grammar to the exclusion of other aspects of language. These are the logical and rhetorical aspects of language; the latter may include semantics or language

operation. Some of the principles which teachers of English may emphasize as significant in the way in which language affects people are: the distinction between statements of fact and statements of judgment; a recognition that language patterns must take the possibility of change into account; the limitation of general statements so that they accord with the facts of life; the avoidance of rigid classifications in the use of polar words. Inclusion of such principles will contribute to the attainment of two important goals in English instruction: (1) to train students to evaluate what they see and hear, and (2) to help students gain control of their language so that it will do what they want it to do. Such principles, Deighton believes, will contribute toward making English a justifiable subject in the curriculum and toward the survival of the English teacher as someone who has a more important role than that of guardian of the nation's grammar. (SAMUEL WEINGARTEN)

Teachers of communication hope that their students will continue to practice in papers written in content courses what they have learned about communication in the basic course in writing. In "A Semantic Scale and Guide for Evaluating Student Papers" (*Etc.*, Autumn, 1952), Herbert Hackett presents a teaching aid which can serve as a beginning toward teaching of better communication in the content course. The Writing Rating Scale contains the following items: (1) Content grade; (2) Writing effectiveness; (3) Choice of words, specificity, simplicity, avoids jargon, etc.; (4) Conceptualization; (5) Antecedents, pronouns, verbs, etc.; (6) Sentence Structure; (7) Statement and limitation of subject, organization, etc.; (8) Value judgments, commenting adjectives, objectivity, etc. A guide for the use of the

Writing Rating Scale elaborates each of these points. Permission to reproduce the Scale and Guide can be obtained from the Editors of *Etc.*, 1356 Hyde Park Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois. (SAMUEL WEINGARTEN)

In "On Resolving the Close Apposition," *American Speech*, October, 1953, Einar Haugen writes a criticism of and supplement to Donald W. Lee's "Close Apposition: An Unresolved Pattern," *American Speech*, December, 1952. The point of view, in the discussion of numerous examples, is that difficulties are "encountered by traditional grammar in describing linguistic forms by a mixture of formal and semantic criteria"; that these notes "call attention to the necessity of analyzing linguistic structure linguistically rather than impressionistically."

David F. Votaw and Paula K. LaForge, in "Rapid Hand Scoring of Cooperative English Tests" (*Junior College Journal*, December, 1953), give suggestions for scoring the tests speedily and simply when scoring machines are not available. The method was worked out at Southwest Texas State Teachers College and requires only one-fifth to one-fourth of the time required by the older method of hand scoring. In addition, inexperienced help can be used successfully.

In "A Theme a Day," *NEA Journal*, September, 1953, Ray C. Maize suggests that high school teachers cease teaching workbook materials and instead make writing a more important and meaningful activity, since students learn their language through repeated and varied writing experiences. To show that such writing can be read, commented on, and



rewarded, the author tells of an experiment at Purdue University with remedial students, the lowest fourth. Half of these were taught by the grammar-workbook-drill method, and wrote one 250-word theme a week for one sixteen-week semester. The other group, taught by a writing laboratory method, wrote the equivalent of a theme a day for a total of forty-two themes. The latter group showed overwhelming evidence of superiority in language use by the end of the semester. All paper reading was done during the assigned classroom hours. One method was to have the classes twice a week divided into groups of five to read all the material of the group members: that is, to read and comment on every paper and to select from each group the one or two best papers. The instructor was available as consultant and commentator. One or two major errors only were looked for at a time. The better papers were made available to the entire class by opaque projection or by mimeographing. The instructor's rapid reading of papers—"a skim technique"—enabled him to evaluate each student's progress and to call attention to one or two major virtues or errors. Part of the theory, which was borne out in practice, was that the student "is confused by so much comment, overwhelmed by attention being called to all his weaknesses and inabilities, discouraged by his evident failures. If, instead, his attention is drawn to a single major issue at a time—an issue that is important—he will be able to progress more readily and naturally toward increased ability to express himself."

Herbert Hackett, in "A New Discipline?—Communication Skills," *Speech Activities*, Winter, 1953, says that "the two basic problems facing the Communication Skills course (however named) are the training of teachers for a much

expanded field, and the development of a new discipline with an integrated philosophy and a common core based on scholarly research. The problems are mutual." Discussing briefly "cores" now in use in various programs such as "meaning" (semantic approach), linguistics, personality development, group dynamics, and "content" (great issues, other basic courses, or literature), the author suggests as the appropriate core "language behavior"—"first a study of the nature of language behavior and second experience with language use." Seven paragraphs of explanation support the suggestion of "language behavior." The article is followed by an introductory bibliography of seventeen titles.

Karl F. Robinson ("Teaching Listening through Evaluation and Criticism," *The Speech Teacher*, September, 1953) suggests evaluation and criticism as a method of classroom speech instruction in order to provide the means to achieve the following purposes: (1) Listening for information, facts, ideas—with recall as the goal; (2) Listening in order to make an intellectual judgment, to criticize, to evaluate ideas; (3) Listening for pleasure, entertainment or enjoyment; (4) Listening to recognize and discriminate (especially speech sounds, words, inflections, etc.); (5) Listening to appreciate (make an aesthetic judgment).

Edited by Herbert Hackett of the University of Utah, the October, 1953, issue of *Education*, is devoted to "Mass Media in the Classroom." Although most of the articles are written for and/or by secondary-school teachers, college teachers will find some of them of interest and value. Among these are:

Earl L. Vance, "Periodical Reading Courses: Their Place and Function in

American Education." The theme of the article: "The amount and character of current periodical reading is an educational and social phenomenon of first importance. Present tastes and habits of adults and students leave much to be desired. Schools can influence reading habits but are not significantly influencing periodical reading habits. Obvious conclusion: schools need to give some real attention to this area."

Earl L. Vance, "Practical Procedure in Teaching Magazine Reading"—a description of the Magazine Reading Course at Florida State University, where the work is given in three six-week units of work each followed by a test, and where each student reads two articles for each class assignment. The class periods are devoted to discussion of the articles—their content, implications, possible fallacies, and general importance.

William Baker, "Notes on the Opaque Projector, Mass Media, and Group Techniques"—a discussion of the opaque projector and its use as an aid in presenting various materials from newspapers and magazines, such as editorials, advertisements, news stories, and the like.

"The Writing Improvement Service," November, 1953, *Basic College Newsletter* (Michigan State College) is a description of the improvement services at Michigan State by The Staff, a service for students—both entering freshmen and upperclassmen—who cannot write clearly and effectively. Assignments, all within the class hours, are given in this order: value, from evidence, of the course, and a short spelling test; a theme, to determine each student's special needs; discussion of spelling, and conferences, with the giving of individualized help, whether it be grammar, sentence structure, organization, or punctuation; learning and drilling on spelling rules; themes shown

by opaque projector; a unit on being specific, based on textbook assignments, a chart of details, observation, and a campus field trip; and as many more theme-writing experiences as time will allow: a character, an event, or a process, with emphasis on careful selection of details, painstaking revision, and proofreading. About eighty per cent of the students attend regularly and about eighty per cent of these are able to produce (C level or better) written assignments by the end of one term. The course grade (satisfactory or unsatisfactory) is determined by each instructor's opinion of the final few themes and the degree of improvement that a student has shown.

Concerning the spelling instruction: Students are "asked to put misspelled words on file cards, learn to spell them by the 'seven step' method devised by Ernest Horn, and pair off and spell their words to a fellow student. [The seven step method: After checking the word in a dictionary, divide the word into syllables: then, (1) say the word aloud, (2) cover the word and spell it silently, (3) check the spelling, (4) cover the word and write it, (5) check the spelling, (6) cover the word and write it again, (7) check the spelling.]"

"What About Students with Deficiencies in Writing?" by Cornelius B. Weber, *Junior College Journal*, November, 1953. In three experimental classes in remedial writing at the College of Marin, the total superiority of the course grades of the experimental students was 34.8 per cent. The following teaching procedures were emphasized: "Student critiques of compositions by fellow students; work groups within the classes according to particular writing disabilities; the instructor's acting as a roving resource person instead of as a lecture-taskmaster; inventories and standardized instruments used to af-

ford the instructor additional psychological insights concerning the members of the experimental classes; a writing workbook utilized as a collection of potentially useful writing patterns; theme topics submitted by the students; a notebook maintained by each student for the correction of errors in his own writing; an anecdotal log kept by the student for the purpose of recording types of writing problems encountered and amount or lack of progress made in working on them."

In "Required Text: The Dictionary" (*Word Study*, October, 1953), Mary Ella Milham describes a one-semester college course in word derivation, Greek and Latin Words in English, at the University of Wisconsin. Neither lectures (except by students) nor formal textbook is used, but a dictionary is required. Concentration is on word roots and their groupings. The course is valuable "not only in vocabulary building, but in public speaking and, equally important, in the use and understanding of the resources of a good dictionary."

"The Measurement of Communication Skills," by Ralph Nichols and Robert J. Keller, *Junior College Journal*, November, 1953—after a brief description of the communication program in the University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics, stressing writing, reading, speaking, and listening according to the students' needs—is primarily concerned with the development of listening tests to measure improvement in listening skill. The four objectives: "(1) to develop a reliable and valid listening test which could be used for sectioning students; (2) to determine the effect of special instruction or training in listening; (3) to compare the ef-

fectiveness of traditional freshman composition courses with the new communication program in terms of listening skills; and (4) to discover the extent of relationships among the four communication skills, particularly between listening and reading." The conclusions are that there is need for further development, refinement, and application of measuring instruments in this comparatively new field of communication skills, and "present evidence indicates that the communication course appears to be a progressive step toward the improvement of the teaching of communication skills. Further refinement of teaching methods and reorganization of the course will undoubtedly be made in terms of this evidence and that which will be acquired by the latter experience . . . Much remains to be done if all four communication skills are to receive their rightful emphasis in introductory college courses."

In "Yours Received, Contents Noted," the November, 1953, *ABWA Bulletin* (American Business Writing Association), A. Bernard R. Shelley describes the course called Business English or Business Correspondence at North Carolina State College. It is a course, not in business or commerce, but in writing designed for students studying technological subjects. Its purpose is "to present the value of clear communication with stress upon natural style and readable copy." With and by the writing of letters, there is a study of the language of business (i.e., business English is "simply standard English adapted to the needs of business") and there is analysis of effective style. Subdivisions of instruction include motivation toward action, avoidance of trite business expressions, psychology of business writing, creative-imaginative writing, and the six C's of business writ-

ing (compactness, concreteness, correctness, character, cheerfulness, and consideration). Materials used for effective teaching include readable essays by business men on the problems of communication, letter writing manuals prepared by business firms for their own use, and actual letters of business firms. Most of the writing assignments are goodwill and public relations letters, sales letters, and letters of application.

Granting that mass media are having a persistent shaping effect upon our information, our outlook, our attitudes, Edgar Dale, in "The Effects of the Mass Media" (*The News Letter*, bringing information to the teacher about the radio, the press, and the motion picture, November, 1953) suggests three constructive courses of action: (1) try to convince people that they are not immune to the symbolic world as brought to us through movies, television, radio, and the press; (2) reject the idea that the free flow of ideas should be impeded either by censorship or by monopoly control; (3) bend every effort to develop the discriminating viewer, listener, and reader. For example, "students should have an opportunity somewhere in their English or social studies curriculum to become acquainted with excellent magazines and daily newspapers."

Donald C. Bryant, in "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Scope" (*Quarterly Journal of Speech*, December, 1953) re-explores, by assignment and with due acknowledgment of the labors of others, the vast area of rhetoric from the mid-twentieth-century point of view. The subdivisions of the subject, discussed in detail, are the following: confusion in the meaning of "rhetoric," as for example its being synonymous with "Freshman Eng-

lish"; a working definition of rhetoric; "The rationale of informative and suasive discourse, it operates chiefly in the areas of the contingent, its aim is the attainment of maximum probability as a basis for public decision, it is the organizing and animating principle of all subject-matters which have a relevant bearing on that decision"; the problems of vocabulary; subjects of rhetorical discourse: finance, war and peace, the defense of the country, imports and exports, legislation, crime and its punishment, all the concerns of justice and injustice, the concerns of teaching, preaching—moral, intellectual, practical and spiritual instruction and exhortation, and commercial exploitation; occasions of rhetorical discourse—in speaking, teaching, newspapers and magazines, in general writing, on the radio and television; relations of rhetoric to other learnings; the functioning of rhetoric, i.e., the function of adjusting ideas to people and of people to ideas; advertising, salesmanship, and propaganda; rhetoric as a method of inquiry; rhetoric in education (a brief history of recent rhetorical scholarship—merits and needs); rhetoric and poetic—relationships and differences. To this long and interesting article, the concluding summarizing paragraph is as follows:

"In brief we may assign to rhetoric a four-fold status. So far as it is concerned with the management of discourse in specific situations for practical purposes, it is an instrumental discipline. It is a literary study, involving linguistics, critical theory, and semantics as it touches the art of informing ideas, and the functioning of language. It is a philosophical study so far as it is concerned with a method of investigation or inquiry. And finally, as it is akin to politics, drawing upon psychology and sociology, rhetoric is a social study, the study of a major force in the behavior of men in society."